

COMMITTEE PRINT—UNREVISED

Note.—This print is for the immediate use of the committee and is  
subject to correction

E. W. G. HUFFMAN, Clerk.

---

# ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

**H. R. 4120**

---

No. 4

---

JANUARY 26, 1935

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY  
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON: 1935

116098

HD 7123  
A5

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina, *Chairman*

SAMUEL B. HILL, Washington  
THOMAS H. CULLEN, New York  
CHRISTOPHER D. SULLIVAN, New York  
MORGAN G. SANDERS, Texas  
JOHN W. McCORMACK, Massachusetts  
DAVID J. LEWIS, Maryland  
FRED M. VINSON, Kentucky  
JERE COOPER, Tennessee  
JOHN W. BOEHNE, Jr., Indiana  
CLAUDE A. FULLER, Arkansas  
WESLEY E. DISNEY, Oklahoma  
ARTHUR P. LAMNECK, Ohio  
FRANK H. BUCK, California  
RICHARD M. DUNCAN, Missouri  
CHESTER THOMPSON, Illinois  
J. TWING BROOKS, Pennsylvania  
JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan

ALLEN T. TREADWAY, Massachusetts  
ISAAC BACHARACH, New Jersey  
FRANK CROWTHER, New York  
HAROLD KNUTSON, Minnesota  
DANIEL A. REED, New York  
ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan  
THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio

E. W. G. HUFFMAN, *Clerk*

HD 7123

A 5

190461

## CONTENTS

| Statements of—                                                                           | Page |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Dr. J. Douglas Brown, director industrial relations section, Princeton University.....   | 245  |
| Miss Katherine Lenroot, Chief, Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor..... | 262  |

## EXHIBIT

|      |     |     |
|------|-----|-----|
| 1000 | ... | ... |
| 2000 | ... | ... |
| 3000 | ... | ... |

## ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 1935

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Robert L. Doughton (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. We will continue hearings on H. R. 4120, and Professor Brown will resume his statement.

### STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS BROWN—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Professor, have you concluded your main statement?

Mr. BROWN. I have just a very brief additional statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please proceed?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wanted to enumerate the more important reasons for two features of our recommendations. First, the gradual stepping-up of the contribution rates under the old-age insurance plan. Our reasons were that the gradual rates of contribution soften the impact of the new charge on industry and on the employee and allow time for necessary economic readjustments.

We feel that to start with a high rate, especially when a high rate is unnecessary, since the insurance fund will be receiving contributions from 40 age groups—that is, from persons aged 20, let us say, to age 65—is unnecessary. In the first years pensions will be paid to, at first, one age group, age 65, then two age groups, ages 65 or 66, and so forth. And since funds are not immediately necessary, it is preferable not to collect more funds than are necessary, particularly in the early years. So the rates of contribution have been held down to, first, 1 percent, then 2 percent, and so on, jumping at 5-year intervals.

The second reason is to hold down the income in the fund until disbursements, as I have just mentioned, are more nearly equal to the receipts, so as to avoid an accumulation of large reserves.

A third reason is that a lower initial rate of contribution aids in the enforcement of the tax. By starting with a 1-percent tax, one half on the employees and one half on the employer, coverage is obtained more readily; more adequate enforcement is possible, since the impact of the tax is small. Then, as time goes on, and the tax has become a customary cost of industry, and a customary charge on the employee, enforcement is more readily possible.

Finally, one or two points concerning the importance of the tax. It is our belief that to the employee this plan of old-age insurance will look virtually like a savings plan. It is, of course, compulsory. But

to the employee the contributions, placed in the fund and matched by the employer, are equivalent to a savings account. Therefore, whenever the employer fails to make a contribution, that is, the employer's own contribution plus the deduction from the employee's wages, the employee has lost by so much part of his savings. And therefore under this scheme every employee virtually becomes an enforcement agent of the tax.

By the use of the stamp book, which is the method used in Great Britain, every employee is aware from time to time of the contributions that have been made to his account. Should any employer fail to attach to the book the stamps which indicate the payment of the tax, the employee is aware of the omission and knows that not only has he lost that amount of money but he has also lost a contribution week in his account.

Mr. KNUTSON. Right there, I should like to ask the witness at this point to describe to us this book of stamps that he has in mind.

Mr. BROWN. I should be glad to.

Mr. KNUTSON. And give us the history of the book from the time the first stamp is placed in it until it is liquidated, if you know what I mean; until the account is closed.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. Following the English method, at the beginning of each 6 months' period, for example, each employee will receive a stamp book or stamp card. First, on obtaining employment, the employee presents the card to the employer, who keeps it as long as the employee continues in employment. Each week during employment the employer purchases a stamp, adding his own share of the contribution to the employee's share. He attaches the stamp to the proper place on the card, thus indicating that the tax has been paid.

In the course of a 6 months' period, for example, there will be 26 places on the card, and when those places are filled, the card is turned in to the proper insurance authority. A permanent record is kept of the fact that that employee's record is complete for 26 weeks, and a new card is issued.

When the man is laid off, he is given back his card. He takes his card to the insurance authority and leaves it on deposit there until he secures a new job. At that time the card is returned to him, presented to the employer, and the same procedure follows.

Mr. KNUTSON. We will assume that the employer and employee both should put up the \$1.50 on that.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. They would put a \$3 stamp on it.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. One stamp would cover both contributions?

Mr. BROWN. Covering both contributions. That would be an indication that for that week the contribution had been paid. It is virtually a mechanistic savings-account book.

Mr. KNUTSON. How is it working out in Great Britain?

Mr. BROWN. It works very well, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. As regards the stamp, is there any indication on the stamp to designate the proper contribution? In other words, suppose a person gets behind or misses 2 or 3 months, would it be possible for him to obtain stamps to cover any of those back payments? Is there a specific place on the card for a stamp for that particular period or that particular date?

Mr. BROWN. There is a place provided for the specific week and when the stamp is attached to that place, it is canceled with the date. That is in order to protect the fund and to have contributions made only in the course of employment as a deduction from the worker's wages and added to by the employer's share.

Mr. DINGELL. What I am driving at is this. Assuming that an individual gets behind, for some reason or another, in these contributions or payments, is it possible for him at a later date to obtain stamps from someone else and transfer it to his own account? In other words, are these stamps dated for that specific period? Is it pasted on any certain part of his card for that date, in order to avoid the possibility of manipulation?

Mr. BROWN. To protect against that, the stamp would be attached by the employer, canceled by the employer, indicating the date. It would be placed in a certain space on the card for that week. That would prevent buying up stamps from someone else, such as a wife or a son, and pasting them into the proper places.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a request and also to ask a question. - Is this card that you hold in your hand one you had made up, or one that was used somewhere else?

Mr. BROWN. This is the card of an English workman.

Mr. REED. I assumed that. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether it would not be of value if we could insert a facsimile of that in the record.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; except that I have to return this to the particular English workman to whom it belongs.

Mr. REED. But you could furnish us a copy.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. There is a question I would like to ask. The compulsory annuity plan does not apply to nonmanual workers receiving more than \$250 a month?

Mr. BROWN. That is right.

Mr. REED. Suppose a nonmanual worker contributes to the fund 10 or 15 years and then goes into the higher-salaried class; does he recover any of the payments that he has made?

Mr. BROWN. Whenever he becomes 65, he receives a pension based on the contributions made in his early life. In other words, he does not receive a return in cash. He has a deferred annuity available to him at the age 65.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman yield on that very point of his question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. My understanding is that there is no case under the contributory annuity system where, after the employee arrives at the age 65, he does not at least get back what he paid, plus interest.

Mr. BROWN. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. That is all included.

Mr. REED. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. VINSON. That is what I thought you had in mind.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. REED. I wanted to clear this up in my own mind. On page 29 of the bill I notice subdivision (d), line 4. Is that the subdivision of the section that applies to the statement you have just made?

Mr. BROWN. That is to cover persons entering the plan after age 60. You see, in the early years of the plan, there will be persons covered who are over 60 or who are just under 60, but who are unable to pay 200 qualifying contributions. We have to arrange to pay back those contributions, because such a person does not qualify for an annuity. That section provides for the return of those payments.

Mr. REED. What part of the bill takes care of the matter I asked you about, concerning the man who has stepped up to a higher-income position?

Mr. BROWN. There is no particular designation of that, but the fact that the annuity is available is based on the number of years of contribution. The rate of contribution automatically takes care of that. The fact that he goes out of coverage for purposes of the tax does not mean that he loses his right to the benefits.

Mr. REED. Are you sure that the bill covers that point?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. Have you had any part in drafting any of the provisions of this bill that we are considering?

Mr. BROWN. I did not actually participate in drafting it, but checked the drafting from time to time.

Mr. TREADWAY. Before it was introduced?

Mr. BROWN. The associate solicitor of the Department of Labor, who was working, along with others, on the drafting, showed us copies from time to time and asked for our criticism.

Mr. TREADWAY. Who do you mean by us?

Mr. BROWN. That is Mr. Latimer and myself particularly, who cooperated in the preparation of recommendations to the committee on economic security.

Mr. TREADWAY. Before there was very much preparation of this measure you and Mr. Latimer laid out recommendations to be incorporated in it, is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Latimer, Mrs. Armstrong, and myself have been working on the principles incorporated here since last August.

Mr. TREADWAY. And that was entirely on your own initiative?

What I mean is this: Are you in any way officially associated with the Government?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. With whom?

Mr. BROWN. With the Committee on Economic Security.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is this committee whose names appear in this report that we have before us?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. And your official position is what?

Mr. BROWN. I was associated as consultant with the staff more particularly concerned with the old-age security part of the general recommendations.

Mr. TREADWAY. But your permanent position is a professor in Princeton University; is that right?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. My full-time position is professor at Princeton University.

Mr. TREADWAY. And you are loaned by the university?

Mr. BROWN. That is right.

Mr. TREADWAY. Are you associated with Professor Kemmerer?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. In his department?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; I have been for many years.

Mr. VINSON. You were specializing upon the old-age pension phase of the bill?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. VINSON. In conjunction with Mr. Latimer and Mrs. Armstrong?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. VINSON. And when you say that they submitted the bill to you, are you referring to a rough draft particularly of the sections affecting old-age pensions?

Mr. BROWN. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, there were other ladies and gentlemen who had that similar function in respect to other sections of the bill?

Mr. BROWN. I suppose so, sir.

Mr. VINSON. What you did not mean to say, of course, is that Mr. Latimer and yourself and Mrs. Armstrong were the only persons to whom it was submitted.

Mr. BROWN. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Have you finished, Mr. Vinson?

Mr. VINSON. No; but I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. Just to clear up this one point. Were you in consultation any of the time that you were checking up on this measure with any of the corporations or organizations that actually are dealing with the old-age pension subject practically in connection with their employees?

Mr. BROWN. I was not, sir; not at the time of the drafting of the bill. Of course, all through the last 4 or 5 months I have, as a part of my regular position at Princeton, and also in connection with the work of the committee, asked the views of many persons outside of the official group here in Washington. I felt that, of course, to be necessary.

Mr. TREADWAY. Have you had occasion to contact the employers of labor in the industrial world as to their practical experience with the operation of this sort of a thing in industry?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. To what extent would you say that this measure corresponds either with the views of or the practical methods employed in carrying out old-age pension systems or unemployment-insurance systems in the actual mills or businesses of these gentlemen?

Mr. BROWN. I may say, sir, that my work for the last 6 or 8 years has been the study of private pension plans, along with public.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is just what I am glad to know. I have been interested to see if we could not run across somebody who had contacted private business.

Mr. BROWN. In the course of the work of the industrial relations section at Princeton, we are handling inquiries and coming into contact with employers and trade unions regularly; and in the course of that contact I have had occasion to study many private industrial pension plans.

Since being associated with the staff of this committee, I have discussed the various problems that we were facing with industrial employers, among them some of the best pension experts in private industrial groups.

Mr. TREADWAY. There are several names mentioned as connected with this committee. It is very difficult, of course, to carry all those in mind, the names of these various high-titled committees; there are so many of them. But the principal committee, as I understand it, is the advisory committee to the Committee on Economic Security—the advisory council.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is the main committee?

Mr. BROWN. There are, you might say, three central groups. There is the permanent staff; that is, the staff that has been regularly employed, associated with the Cabinet committee.

There is, secondly, the technical advisory board.

Mr. TREADWAY. That group that you are mentioning now are all Government employees?

Mr. BROWN. Government people; yes, sir.

Then the advisory council, that you just mentioned, which, I believe, is made up of industrialists, labor officials, and other people representing the public.

Mr. TREADWAY. When you speak of industrialists, do you refer to the presidents of these corporations whose names appear here?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. To what extent—I have asked a somewhat similar question of Dr. Witte, without very great success—to what extent have those corporations or representatives from those corporations actively participated in advising or checking up or passing upon the contents of this measure that we have before us?

Mr. BROWN. I feel that at least a majority of the five industrial members made a very close study of the old-age insurance program. I believe all five know very fully all the problems involved. For example, in the case of Mr. Teagle, I was in contact with the executive assistant to Mr. Teagle, who is directly in charge of these problems, and discussed it fully with him.

Mr. TREADWAY. You are referring to Mr. Walter C. Teagle, president of the Standard Oil Co.?

Mr. BROWN. President of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. I felt it would be best not only to give Mr. Teagle the opportunity of discussing it, but also his particular adviser. That is, I discussed it with his adviser.

In the case of Mr. Folsom, Mr. Latimer and I have had repeated conferences concerning the old-age insurance program.

In the case of Mr. Leeds, whom I have known personally for many years, I have had several conferences with him and I know that he knows fully the problems involved in the recommendations.

Mr. Lewisohn, who has been president of the American Management Association, is also fully aware of what is involved, as is Mr. Swope.

Mr. TREADWAY. So that you feel that the industrialists themselves—and certainly that is a very distinguished group of employers—you feel that the industrialists themselves are not only familiar with this measure, but, in your judgment, approve it?

Mr. BROWN. I do, sir. I speak certainly for the progressive group of employers who realize the problem of old age and in that group most certainly are all of our larger companies in this country.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is, these five gentlemen, representing a much larger group of general employers, represent, in your opinion, the views of these general employers?

Mr. BROWN. That is correct. In fact, I have tested that against other employers, not on our committee.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is what I would like to know. That is what I have been trying to get at, just that information.

Mr. BROWN. This particular program incorporated in the bill acts as a basic pension protection. It does not go anywhere near as high as some private pension plans, particularly in the case of higher-paid employees.

This is a social-insurance annuity program, not a private annuity program, so that all of these more progressive companies who already have pension plans can merely permit this protection to offset the lower level of protection they are already affording and then go beyond it if they are so inclined.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let me see if I understand just what you mean by that; that if this bill called for a contribution of \$15 by the Federal Government, matched by \$15 from the State, became effective, making a payment of \$30 to an employee, and if that employee was qualified to receive, say, \$60 from the company by whom he was employed, then the company would assume the other \$30 payment, is that right?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir. I was discussing the contributory old-age insurance side of it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I was confused. But it is the same principle, in a sense, is it not?

Mr. BROWN. It would be, sir. Suppose a man's contribution plus his employer's contribution entitled him to \$75 under this plan, and he were a higher-paid employee, say entitled to \$100 under the former company plan, the company would make certain provisions that whatever the Federal annuity plan provided would be offset against their obligation under the private plan.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then you would relieve the private employer or company or part of their annuity burden?

Mr. BROWN. Except, of course, that they contribute under the plan.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does not the Pennsylvania Railroad have a very extensive old-age retirement system?

Mr. BROWN. They have not had any funded pension program. They merely paid pensions at the time a man came to be 70 years old, out of operating income.

Mr. TREADWAY. And that went as a direct charge against the annual income of the carrier?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. That was the principle, which, of course, was considered in the Federal bill, namely that it was taking from the road the money providing for the pension and putting it into a Federal fund.

Mr. TREADWAY. Assuming this bill becomes law, or the ideas incorporated in the bill become law, will that relieve the railroads, using the Pennsylvania Railroad as an illustration—there are several others, the New York Central, and, I think probably a large number that have these retirement funds—will that relieve the railroads of this obligation that they have assumed?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will it relieve them of a certain part of their burden?

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman that railroad employees are excluded from the bill expressly, because of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is a provision of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then that would not apply.

Mr. VINSON. Professor Brown, referring to the gentlemen mentioned, Mr. Swope, the president of General Electric; Mr. Leeds, the president of Leeds & Northrup; Mr. Lewisohn, vice president of the Miami Copper Co.; Mr. Teagle, president of the Standard Oil Co.; Mr. Folsom, assistant treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co.; many of these gentlemen are connected with companies that have private old-age pension plans?

Mr. BROWN. I would say that all of them have private plans.

Mr. VINSON. Not only did the Committee on Economic Security and your group particularly consider the plans in these industries, but I want to ask you if there was any private plan for old-age pension in the United States that you gentlemen knew of that you did not consider in arriving at your conclusions.

Mr. BROWN. I believe we considered every plan in existence in this country.

Mr. VINSON. For instance, yesterday it was suggested that Senator Couzens had provided a fund in Michigan; evidently it was thought that that was a new thing to the Committee on Economic Security. You gentlemen had that fact before you and had full knowledge of the plan that is in force in Michigan, did you not?

Mr. BROWN. I believe so, sir.

Mr. VINSON. And you did not confine your studies to the situation here in this country, but you studied thoroughly the old-age pension systems abroad.

Mr. BROWN. I may say that Mr. Latimer, who is associated with the committee, is considered the leading expert in this country on industrial pensions, and has prepared, over a period of years, a most voluminous book on the subject, which is the classic work in the field.

Mr. VINSON. He made a very splendid statement to the committee the other day.

Now, Mr. Brown, under the contributory annuities provision as set forth in the proposed bill, we have a contribution on the part of the employer and the employee.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Did you give any consideration to contributions on the part of any governmental units to this fund?

Mr. BROWN. We considered very carefully, sir, contributions by the Federal Government, because, in the study of our plan, as I mentioned yesterday, it became necessary to meet several variables, one of which is the size of the reserve; the other is the payment of adequate benefits in the early years of the scheme.

Because of both of those problems, the staff of the committee felt that it was best to recommend a Federal contribution to the fund in the later years of the plan, beginning 1965 and from then on. That is, in essence, a repayment of part, at least, of the so-called "unearned annuity" paid to older persons entering the plan as of 1937.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question at this point, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What had you in mind when you said governmental contributions?

Mr. VINSON. I had in mind the Federal Government, State governments, possibly even lesser units; but governmental units. I had "government" in mind.

Now, I understand the reasoning, Professor Brown, that you submit to us. The thought in my mind is that there may be estimates that have been made to date, based upon the best evidence obtainable, that, in the next 45 years may prove to be grievously in error.

The thought I had in my mind was whether or not you ought to build today for that eventuality, between 1965 and 1980, or whether we ought to lower our sights somewhat and build for that period but at the same time not "pass the buck" too much; go along for a few years with proper benefits and then, with the experience of those years—5 or 10 years—we will be able to build upon a foundation that may be more secure than the one we are visualizing today.

Mr. BROWN. I believe that the bill does have in it that philosophy to this extent, that the starting of contributions at the rate of 1 percent for 5 years and 2 percent for the following 5 years, and so on, does permit a period of reconsideration, you might say, if necessary. During any of those 5-year periods the rate of contribution may be adjusted upward faster, or there may be a delay, for example, if the fund should get too large.

But there is a possibility of adjustment over a period of 10—20 years in the future, and we feel as economists and persons interested in social insurance, that you cannot arrive at perfection in any brief time. It is necessary to look forward to adjustments in the future, in such a vast program as this.

Mr. VINSON. Referring again to the 5 leading "industrialists," so-called, who are on this advisory committee, can you say that there is any difference on substantial principles between their views and the recommendations of this bill, in regard to old-age pensions?

Mr. BROWN. The sequence was this, sir. These recommendations, have been in virtually this form since early November, going through periods of testing. When we tested them by the industrial group, we found the need of no essential change in the program.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you refer to old-age pensions or annuities?

Mr. VINSON. Old-age annuities or pensions.

Mr. BROWN. I was thinking of the contributory-insurance program in which the employers are most interested. The old-age program was presented as a threefold program to the industrial advisory group.

Mr. REED. Mr. Brown, I am sorry I have to leave at this time, and there is one question I should like to ask before I go. How many industries, if you know, approximately, in the country, employing four people or more, will fall within the purview of this legislation?

Mr. BROWN. How many employers?

Mr. REED. How many concerns employing four or more people will fall within the purview of this legislation?

Mr. BROWN. Employing units?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I am afraid I do not have the figure in those terms, but in the case of this bill, the recommendation is to cover plants of one or more employees.

Mr. VINSON. That is as to old-age pensions?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. REED. I am talking about unemployment insurance. How many concerns are there in the country who employ four or more persons, that will fall within the purview of this proposed legislation? What is the total number, if you know?

Mr. BROWN. I am afraid I could not answer that.

Mr. REED. Do any of the witnesses who will appear before us have that information, so far as you know?

Mr. BROWN. Perhaps Mr. Latimer has. I can find the information, sir.

Mr. REED. You can find it readily?

Mr. BROWN. Not at this moment.

Mr. REED. I mean, you could put the information in the record?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. Would it be possible to break that down into the various States?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Brown, as I understand it, this plan would be, in effect, financed through a sales tax in that the cost of its operation would be passed on to the consumer?

Mr. BROWN. On the employee's side, of course, it is virtually an income tax on a very low level. I suppose that the economic principle would be that it would not be shifted. In the case of the employers' tax, there will be a possibility of shifting it to the customer, and it may therefore become virtually a regressive tax, as a sales tax.

That was one reason I mentioned yesterday for the possibility of the Federal contribution in later years. Those contributions, coming from income taxes, are progressive taxes, not regressive.

Mr. KNUTSON. I take it that you have made a study of the entire field of insurance.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. I am not an actuary, but I have studied the subject.

Mr. KNUTSON. You have made a study of it?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. While the question I am about to ask you does not deal with this particular section of the bill, I would very much like to have your views with reference to the Townsend plan of old-age insurance, if you can give us a short statement on it. We are hearing a great deal about that these days, and the committee should get all possible information.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

As an economist, associated with this group, I have made a very serious study of the Townsend bill. I did not think that any proposal that had such wide popular support should be disregarded from a scientific point of view.

I may say that I was very sympathetic with the idea of these older people being protected, but I feel that the program is both illusory

and dangerous. It is wishful thinking from an economic point of view. It is what we wish, not what we can do.

Our economic system is so delicately adjusted, as we have seen during these past 5 years, that the placing on it of any burden such as the bill proposes would have the most serious effects and would be impossible, in my judgment.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the Townsend plan—you say it is not operative?

Mr. BROWN. That is it.

Mr. KNUTSON. If it were adopted by Congress, how long would it be before it would break down?

Mr. BROWN. I think it would break down immediately, because the first effect would be to so undermine business confidence that instead of having any resumption, we would have a continuance, of this depression.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will you tell us why?

Mr. BROWN. There are two sources for these huge funds: In the first place, you can tax for them. In case you do so, you dry up the tax sources, because you discourage business. A tax is a drag upon business if it reaches the heights necessary in the proposal of that bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. How high would that tax be?

Mr. BROWN. It would become, I believe, a 6 percent sales tax, in essence. They suggest 2 percent, but I cannot see but that it would be at least 6 percent. For that matter, I cannot see the possibility of accumulating the funds from any means of taxation such as they suggest.

Mr. KNUTSON. In your judgment, Mr. Brown, would the operation of the Townsend plan so increase the volume of business that the tax, in effect, would be reduced to 2 percent? I received a letter the other day to the effect that the operation of the Townsend plan would result in increasing the retail sales of this country from 40 billion to 200 billion. That is an increase of 500 percent.

Mr. BROWN. That is impossible, because it would be impossible to develop the momentum to secure that expansion of business. Our present production capacity would not permit that expansion over a long period of years.

For example, the total revenue receipts of all units of Government in 1932 was 11½ billion. This bill requires 24 billion a year, or greater than all the revenues of all the governmental units in this country.

Likewise, compared to the wealth income of this country, it becomes excessive. It would not mean merely practically the whole wage bill of the country being absorbed, but more than the wage bill of the country.

And it would be concentrated, as a benefit, on 8½ percent of the people. I would like to say that being in a position of advising with responsible government, it seems highly dangerous to have old people feel that these things are possible. In the case of our recommendations, we have attempted to be as liberal as possible within the framework of our economic system.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was the thought of your committee, then, to give us a plan that was absolutely sound?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. That starts at the grass roots and is capable of development as we prove it?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. Or as it proves itself, rather.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is your conviction that the Townsend plan, if put into operation, would blow up immediately?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; it would kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, you might say.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it might set back the cause of old-age pensions 25 years or more?

Mr. BROWN. I am sure it would, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. From the studies you have made thus far of the Townsend plan, it would be absolutely essential as a part of the scheme to inflate the currency to the point of worthlessness to carry out that program, would it not?

Mr. BROWN. I feel so. It would be impossible to secure the funds through taxation, so that it might be necessary to obtain a large proportion of the fund through inflation. It would be merely adding to the money supply, like adding so many beer checks with the same amount of beer, so that the production of the country, which is the real test of prosperity, would have to be spread over more people.

Mr. DINGELL. Let us make that rent checks instead of beer checks.

Mr. BROWN. Very well.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield to me for just one question?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Doctor, just one question on the observation made by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Knutson). As I caught your reply, the so-called "Townsend plan" would involve an amount of about \$24,000,000,000?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. Now, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota: Did I correctly understand you in stating that you had received information from some source that this plan would result in a business of \$200,000,000,000 in the country?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. As I understand the theory of the Townsends, it is that by compelling the pensioners to spend the amount of money that they receive each month, in the month in which they receive it, it would swell the gross volume of business from 40 billions to 200 billions. Of course, if that were true, it would, in effect, reduce the tax by 80 percent, would it not?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; if that were true.

Mr. COOPER. If only \$24,000,000,000 of money is paid out under the plan, how is that going to be turned into \$200,000,000,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am merely asking for information, may I say to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure of that.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is claimed that 22,000,000 people have signed a petition that will shortly be presented to Congress—or petitions—asking for the adoption of the Townsend plan. We have before us

now a question of pensions and, as Professor Brown very aptly said, a plan that is being petitioned for by 22,000,000 people cannot lightly be brushed aside, or should not be brushed aside until we have given it most thorough consideration.

Mr. COOPER. My purpose was not directed to that point. I was just seeking some additional information on the figures that have been cited here.

Mr. KNUTSON. The theory is that by compelling the pensioner to spend his money during the month in which he receives it, it will swell the gross volume of business from 40 billions to 200 billions. That is substantially correct?

Mr. BROWN. That is what they say. I utterly disagree with the statement, sir, that that would follow.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is, you say that it cannot be done?

Mr. BROWN. Absolutely.

Mr. COOPER. How much, in your opinion, would it swell or increase the volume of business, Dr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. I should say that the passage of the bill would reduce business because of the fear of inflation and the fear of high taxes; I say that the very reverse would take place as against this supposed increase in production and consumption.

Mr. COOPER. In other words, we would have the reverse take place, instead of the suggested increase?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. An exception in the old-age pension element in the bill has been made for governmental divisions, local and Federal, and also for the railways?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. In other words, the old-age pension feature would not apply to railway employees. But the unemployment-insurance element of the bill, of course, would apply to railway employees?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. That is clear?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. Just one other question with regard to the consultation which has taken place by your committee with the leading industrialists of the country. Their views, I think, were already pretty well known; their views with respect to unemployment insurance?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. Through their contributions in a hearing on the subject before this committee last year.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. And those hearings were available to the committee?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. Are you familiar with them, Professor?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. That is all.

Mr. BROOKS. Professor, to return again to this stamp book, do I understand that this tax is going to be collected weekly?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; either weekly or monthly, according to the pay period of the employee.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it possible for any man to have two of those cards?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir. That is, except through fraud, of course. He makes his original application in the beginning, has his name entered in the records of the plant, and is given his original card with

a number. Then, throughout life, whenever he turns in the card, that is filed with his account, and he receives a new card only by submitting a new application.

Mr. BROOKS. We have a number of men, if our hours of labor shorten, especially, in this country, who work on two different jobs or who will work on two different jobs. They may work 4 or 5 or 6 hours in one place and then they will go and be employed over again somewhere else. I was wondering whether it was possible for such a man to secure cards from each employer.

Mr. BROWN. I believe that there would have to be a regulation whereby some arrangement could be made, where the income is obtained from two sources. I believe that could be handled by regulation. Of course, it would be fraud for him to attempt to obtain two cards.

Mr. BROOKS. On the question of wages, this is limited to \$150 a month?

Mr. BROWN. The coverage of the tax is \$250.

Mr. BROOKS. \$250 a month?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I have a pay roll made up principally of pieceworkers.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. That pay roll varies from month to month. Suppose I have a month when a certain man runs over \$250 a month. Am I taxed as an employer only on the \$250, or am I taxed upon the total of the pay roll?

Mr. BROWN. If he is a manual worker, it does not stop at \$250. It is only the nonmanual worker that stops at \$250. If he is a manual worker, like a plasterer or a bricklayer, and he is on some rush job and gets \$300 a month, he would still be covered. It is only the clerical employees, the nonmanual employees, who stop at \$250, and in their cases their salaries are more regular, so that you can take an average of the last 3 months—something of that sort.

Mr. BROOKS. As an employer of men on piecework, I pay a tax on \$250 a month and over?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; if they are manual employees.

Mr. BROOKS. I think that is a severe penalty on the employer.

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; because, taking the wages paid on a piece basis, or in the case of building trades, on an hourly basis, very often those incomes are irregular throughout the year, so that they would not average over \$250 a month for the year.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to ask a question reverting back to the Townsend idea. The Townsendites assume an increase in business from \$40,000,000,000 to \$200,000,000,000 as a result of the acceleration of circulation of the dollar. Is that the basis for their contention?

Mr. BROWN. That is what they say, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it not at the same time true that because of the tremendous volume of dollars with possibly no metallic value that would be outstanding in the event of necessary inflation to sustain the plan, the dollar would be so cheap as to make it necessary for a housewife going to a bakery to take a bushel basket full of paper currency to buy one loaf of bread?

Mr. BROWN. It might well be when inflation starts. If I may be permitted, it is like putting a fire under a mule. He may first twitch his ears, then he goes off at high speed. If this Townsend bill were put into effect, the first result of inflation might be only slight, but

we do not know when the critical point is passed, when prices might rise very rapidly.

Mr. DINGELL. Prices rise very rapidly and the value of money falls correspondingly?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAMNECK. Dr. Brown, when are the first payments made under this annuity system?

Mr. BROWN. The first payments would be made 5 years from the initiation of the plan; that is, the initiation of contributions; if it were initiated January 1, 1937, the first payments would be made January 1, 1942.

Mr. LAMNECK. Of course those payments would not be anything like \$30 a month or anything of that kind?

Mr. BROWN. In the case of the contributory insurance of which we are speaking, the payments would range from \$7.50 for a person averaging \$50 up to \$15 for a person averaging \$100 a month, and so on.

Mr. LAMNECK. What do you do with the person who draws only \$7.50? Do you pay him some additional out of the old-age pension?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; in case he were in need he would receive aid from the Federal-State cooperative old-age assistance system.

Mr. LAMNECK. When the annuity system gets at its peak, say in—what year is that, 1980?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; that is our last figure here.

Mr. LAMNECK. How much money would be accumulated in this fund at that time?

Mr. BROWN. Under the plan as proposed in the bill, the total reserve in the fund would be \$15,266,000,000.

Mr. LAMNECK. As I recall it, we had some testimony here earlier in the hearing that there would be \$74,000,000,000 in that event at that time.

Mr. BROWN. That was under another proposal. That was a proposal for a so-called "earned pension" only, whereby you hold back every cent that is contributed by every contributor, and hold it for at least 30 or 40 years, until he is 65. You become then a trustee for all contributions at once.

Mr. LAMNECK. You do not believe such a plan would be possible or practical, do you?

Mr. BROWN. I feel it very inferior to our program here.

Mr. HILL. You say to hold back all the funds for 30 or 40 years—all the funds that have been contributed?

Mr. BROWN. That would be the straight-earned plan.

Mr. HILL. I understood that you simply decline to pay out any unearned annuities but would pay out all unearned annuities commencing 5 years after the effective date of the act.

Mr. BROWN. I meant, sir, that under that plan which involves the \$75,000,000,000 reserve you would pay the earned annuities but not the unearned.

Mr. HILL. You would not hold back all payments?

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. HILL. You would pay the earned annuities?

Mr. BROWN. As a man came to be 65, you would necessarily pay him his earned annuity.

Mr. HILL. It might be only a few cents a month?

Mr. BROWN. That is it; 48 cents for a person averaging \$100 a month.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Brown, I notice you said here a little while ago that in your opinion these business men that are on this board are all in favor of this program.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAMNECK. That it was satisfactory to big business. What consideration have you given to the effect upon small business?

Mr. BROWN. I may say, sir, that Mr. Leeds does not represent so-called "big business" because he has a small concern. For that matter, Mr. Lewisohn, for example, I believe has been chairman of the American Management Association Board, which includes many small businesses.

Mr. LAMNECK. What other investigation have you made?

Mr. BROWN. I have talked with representatives of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, as I mentioned; Mr. Teagle's company.

Mr. LAMNECK. You would not call that a small business, would you.

Mr. BROWN. No, sir. I have talked in the course of the fall with persons who have studied or been connected with many small businesses, for example, Prof. C. C. Balderston, who is in close contract with small concerns in Philadelphia, and other persons connected with small and large concerns from the insurance point of view, as well as other industrialists or students of the subject.

Mr. LAMNECK. You would admit that a big business might be able to carry burdens such as proposed in this bill, and the small business might not be able to carry them, would you not?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; because the cost of old age is related directly to the number of workers employed. If you have two employees, your burden is the old-age pension of two employees. If you have 2,000 or 200,000, it is in direct ratio. I feel it is perfectly fair to attach to the cost of small business as well as large, the protection of its employees.

Mr. LAMNECK. It is just, but would the effect be the same?

Mr. BROWN. I think these percentages you will see are very small, especially in the first years. The 1-percent tax, in fact, a half of 1 percent tax on an employer, would be a very small sum, even for the smallest employer.

Mr. LAMNECK. The tax assessed against the pay roll in 5 years from the passage of this bill will be 8 percent of the pay roll, will it not?

Mr. BROWN. The tax would be a half percent on the employer and a half percent on the employee in the first 5 years. Then it would jump to 1 percent on the employee and 1 percent on the employer during the next 5 years.

Mr. LAMNECK. It finally reaches 2½ percent on each one?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; after 20 years.

Mr. LAMNECK. Then there is a 3-percent levy for unemployment insurance?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. LAMNECK. That makes a total of 8 percent.

Mr. BROWN. You are including the employee's contribution, too. On the employer it would be 3 percent, with 2½ percent at the peak. That is 5½ percent on the employer. I know of concerns paying at least 3½ percent for pensions alone at this time for protection of their older workers.

Mr. DINGELL. When would that peak be reached?

Mr. BROWN. By 1957, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the position of the National Association of Manufacturers is with respect to this legislation?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the position of the United States Chamber of Commerce is?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir. We did not meet with those people officially.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know what their point of view is?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want to inquire about the machinery for the collection of the tax. Suppose an employee is working for an employer; as I understand it, he has a stamp that is placed upon a card, and that is canceled.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. How is that tax paid? How does it get into the tax-collecting office?

Mr. BROWN. The employer purchases the stamps either from the pension authority or the local post office. Even in the smallest town where there is a post office these stamps could be purchased in proper denominations. He buys those in advance, on Saturday, let us say, and attaches the proper stamp to the card for that employee.

Mr. LAMNECK. That purchase is made also on behalf of the employee?

Mr. BROWN. Employer and employee both.

Mr. LAMNECK. And each employer that he may have is chargeable and responsible for the payment of the tax?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any specified time that an employee would have to work before this bill, if it becomes law, would be operative as to him? In other words, does this bill include employment of an employee who works for an employer a negligible length of time?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. We feel it is necessary to include all employment down to a reasonable minimum, from the administrative point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you classify as a reasonable minimum, working 3 or 4 days or a week or 2?

Mr. BROWN. I should say it would be a reasonable minimum to stop at 1 or 2 days. The test of that is an administrative one.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an administrative matter, rather than one to be stated in the law?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement of fact here with regard to the cost of the tax to the manufacturer, as to which Mr. Lamneck was speaking:

In the latest census of manufacturers available to me, the wholesale value of products of manufacture in that year was 62½ billions of dollars. The percentage of the total value of the product allocated to wages and salaries was 24.4. On that basis, speaking now of manufacturers alone, not of mines, not of railways, and not of some other industries, the 5½-percent tax which would be reached at length in 1957, would amount to 1.3 percent increase on the wholesale value of the products. The tax looks large; when it is applied to the price, it is reduced by about four times. Instead of thinking of 5.5 percent as the employer's contribution for old-age pensions and unemploy-

ment insurance when the plan reaches its ultimate development, we can think of 1.3 cents to the dollar of wholesale value in manufactured products.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, it would fall heavier upon the employer than it would the consuming public? Is that what you are trying to suggest?

Mr. LEWIS. It would fall with about four times the force on the pay roll than it would on the price of the article sold.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other questions, we thank you, Mr. Brown, for your appearance and the information you have given to the committee.

#### **STATEMENT OF KATHARINE LENROOT, CHIEF CHILDREN'S BUREAU, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Miss Katharine Lenroot, representing the Children's Bureau.

Will you please come forward, Miss Lenroot, and give the stenographer your full name, your official position, and your connection with this legislation?

Miss LENROOT. Katharine Lenroot, chief Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

I have with me, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Martha Eliot, the assistant chief of the Bureau, who is a physician. If the committee desires to ask certain questions, it may be that I should like to refer some of those to her.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule under which we have been operating is that the witness reads his or her main statement, and then at the conclusion of the main statement is available for questioning. If you prefer, you may complete your main statement.

Miss LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee:

The Children's Bureau was asked by the technical staff of the Committee on Economic Security to act in a consultative capacity with regard to, especially, sections or parts of the security program relating to child health and child welfare. An advisory committee on child welfare, whose names are included in the record, that has already been made, worked with the Children's Bureau in the developing of the factual material and recommendations that went to the cabinet committee on Economic Security.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the child-welfare provisions of this bill are a very integral part of the entire Economic Security program. The importance of including some special provisions with reference to the security of children arises out of the fact that, as we all know, children have suffered very greatly by reason of the depression, both in respect to health and those other circumstances which are essential to normal childhood, normal growth, and development.

Moreover, as other witnesses before this committee have pointed out, when we come to attempt to provide for the unemployed, especially for the unemployed now on relief, by measures which will enable them to become again self-supporting, through private industrial recovery or through a works program, or in lieu of such measures, looking mainly toward the future, measures for providing unemployment compensation, there are certain groups of families which cannot be reached by such measures because the breadwinners are absent. It is these groups of families that we have particularly in mind in one of the sections of the bill.

The measures that have been selected and that were outlined to you yesterday very fully by Mr. Witte, are, of course, in no sense representative of a complete child-welfare or child-health program in this country. It was felt that it would be most logical and most reasonable to select those parts of the child-welfare or child-health program which were in the first place very closely related to our program of unemployment; in the second place, attempted to meet the basic needs of children everywhere throughout the country—need for economic security when the father is absent from the home, the need for a measure of health protection, which must be supplied through community activities and community agencies; and in the third place, need for special social protection when grave conditions of incompetency or neglect or abuse or defect in the child himself are present.

That, then, covers the three sections of the bill relating to mothers' pensions, to aid to child-welfare services, and to aid for maternal and child-health services. In addition, there is the section of the bill relating to crippled children. That does present a selection of one group of especially handicapped children for special attention. Other groups, as was pointed out yesterday, the feeble-minded, the blind, and the deaf, have not been included in the program except insofar as the child-health services which will be provided and the social services provided in the aid to child-welfare activities will place our local communities in a very much better position to find out where there are children in need of care, to bring together existing resources, and to develop further experience as to the total child-care program in the country. The provisions, then, with reference to children's security do not contemplate any lessening of the burden now being carried by State and local agencies or by private voluntary agencies, such as the Shriners, the Couzens' Fund, and many other private undertakings which are rendering very great service to children in this country.

The provisions of the bill would only attempt to make universally available throughout the United States certain minimum measures of public protection without which any private effort or any purely local effort is bound to be spotty and to be most inadequate in the places and areas where children are in the greatest need.

Moreover, the provisions of this bill regarding children's security do not set up any new or untried methods of procedure, but build upon experience that has been well established in this country. In that sense, I feel that the children's security measures are essentially American measures, building upon American experience, and designed to establish a foundation of Federal, State, and local cooperation which will not lead us into any difficult administrative realms or into any unpredictable costs.

The amounts of money included in the bill are very conservative, as I shall point out in discussion of the specific sections. We might well have justified larger requests, but we felt that in undertaking programs of this kind there were certain administrative developments that had to be made, there were questions of availability of personnel that had to be settled, and since this is not an emergency measure, but a measure for permanent cooperation, it was felt that it was better to begin on a modest basis with a program that we thought could immediately be put into effect.

Now, to come to the mothers' pension features of the bill, section 201, page 9. Dr. Witte gave you considerable material yesterday

which I shall not repeat. There was a question asked yesterday as to the extent to which the State mothers' aid laws were actually operative. As was said yesterday, there are 45 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, that have on their statute books this form of legislation, the first such law having been passed in 1911; the very rapid development of this type of legislation being due to the fact that the public recognized the importance of the State or locality stepping in to supplement income when the father was removed from his family.

However, many of these laws are not mandatory but are only permissive on the local units. There are 27 States with mandatory laws, 22 States with permissive laws, and 3 States with no laws—and I am including here the Territories and the District of Columbia. Even where the mandatory laws are on the statute books, the depression has meant that some counties have not been able or at least have not seen fit to raise the funds necessary to carry out the mandatory provisions of the State law.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a table which I should like to insert in the record, showing the percentage of counties granting aid in each State where the counties are given jurisdiction. There are a few States, particularly in New England, where the cities or towns are given jurisdiction, and we do not have information for all those local units.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be inserted in the record.

Miss LENROOT. This also shows the per-capita expenditures for mothers' aid in the different States.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

TABLE I.—*Extent to which mothers' aid is provided: Per-capita expenditures and percentages of counties granting aid by States*

| State                     | Percentage of counties granting aid | Per-capita expenditures | State               | Percentage of counties granting aid | Per-capita expenditures |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Alabama.....              | No mothers' aid law.                |                         | Missouri.....       | 10 <sup>1</sup>                     | .03                     |
| Alaska.....               | (1)                                 | (1)                     | Montana.....        | 82 <sup>2</sup>                     | .46                     |
| Arizona.....              | State-wide                          | .05                     | Nebraska.....       | 86                                  | .20                     |
| Arkansas.....             | Mothers' aid discontinued.          |                         | Nevada.....         | 71                                  | .41                     |
| California.....           | State-wide                          | .35                     | New Hampshire.....  | State-wide                          | .18                     |
| Colorado.....             | 54                                  | .14                     | New Jersey.....     | do                                  | .61                     |
| Connecticut.....          | State-wide                          | .46                     | New Mexico.....     | Law not in operation.               |                         |
| Delaware.....             | do                                  | .39                     | New York.....       | 81                                  | .93                     |
| District of Columbia..... | do                                  | .30                     | North Carolina..... | 74                                  | .02                     |
| Florida.....              | 67                                  | .15                     | North Dakota.....   | 77                                  | .39                     |
| Georgia.....              | No mothers' aid law.                |                         | Ohio.....           | 96                                  |                         |
| Hawaii.....               | (1)                                 | (1)                     | Oklahoma.....       | 62 <sup>3</sup>                     | .05                     |
| Idaho.....                | 75                                  | .10                     | Oregon.....         | 69                                  | .26                     |
| Illinois.....             | 81                                  | .20                     | Pennsylvania.....   | 85                                  | .34                     |
| Indiana.....              | 75                                  | .11                     | Puerto Rico.....    | Law not in operation.               |                         |
| Iowa.....                 | 98                                  | .29                     | Rhode Island.....   | State-wide                          | .39                     |
| Kansas.....               | 36                                  | .04                     | South Carolina..... | No mothers' aid law.                |                         |
| Kentucky.....             | (2)                                 | .02                     | South Dakota.....   | 78                                  | .47                     |
| Louisiana.....            | 5                                   | .004                    | Tennessee.....      | 4                                   | .03                     |
| Maine.....                | State-wide                          | .39                     | Texas.....          | 3                                   | .008                    |
| Maryland.....             | 33                                  | .07                     | Utah.....           | 48                                  | .15                     |
| Massachusetts.....        | State-wide                          | .58                     | Vermont.....        | State-wide                          | .13                     |
| Michigan.....             | 43                                  | .51                     | Virginia.....       | 44                                  | .01                     |
| Minnesota.....            | 91                                  | .44                     | Washington.....     | 92                                  | .36                     |
| Mississippi.....          | Mothers' aid discontinued.          |                         | West Virginia.....  | 4                                   | .007                    |
|                           |                                     |                         | Wisconsin.....      | 89                                  | .74                     |
|                           |                                     |                         | Wyoming.....        | 43 <sup>3</sup>                     | .10                     |

<sup>1</sup> No report.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 1 percent.

<sup>3</sup> Based on number of counties granting aid June 30, 1931.

Miss LENROOT. The very great variability as to the coverage of these acts as between the States is illustrated by the fact that the percentages of counties within a State granting aid range from less than 1 percent to 100 percent, and that the per-capita expenditures within a State range from less than one-half of 1 percent per capita to 93 cents per capita. These facts are given in the table.

I would also like to call attention to the expenditures for mothers' aid and the basis upon which we arrived at an estimate of \$25,000,000 as necessary for the first year or two. The report of the committee indicated that the necessary contribution of the Federal Government might rise to as high as \$50,000,000, as the plan develops.

As Mr. Witte said yesterday, the total local and State expenditures now being made under mothers' pension statutes are about \$37,000,000. That amount of money is not only not reaching more than half of the counties authorized to grant aid, but it is also affording in many cases only a very minimum amount of aid per family.

For example, the average grants per family in 1931 ranged from about \$4.33 per month per family to about \$69 per month per family.

Therefore, in setting up this system we ought to look forward both to an increase of the coverage in terms of areas, in terms of families aided, and, too, in most States, to an increase in adequacy of the grants.

In this total of \$37,000,000, there are about \$6,000,000 of State funds. We felt that it was logical to expect the States to increase their contributions for this purpose. Only through equalization funds coming from an area at least as wide as a State can the children in the poorest areas be given substantially the same protection, or at least a minimum standard of protection, that children in the richer areas obtain. The States will be responsible primarily for the administration of the Federal aid which is granted. We feel that it is reasonable to expect a substantial State contribution to this form of aid. The bill requires such a substantial contribution to this form of aid.

We therefore feel that the \$25,000,000 provided in the bill, plus some increase in State funds, which we feel it is reasonable to expect very promptly, inasmuch as a considerable amount of State money is now going into emergency relief for families of identical types, which would be found to be eligible to aid—if those funds could be increased to \$50,000,000, with the Federal grant of \$25,000,000, there would be a total expenditure for this purpose of \$75,000,000 or approximately twice the amount now going into this form of aid.

This admittedly may not reach the total problem. We estimate on the basis of figures made available by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, checked by certain State studies, that the total amount of money that ought to be going into this form of aid in this country at the present time if there were adequate coverage, is about \$120,000,000.

I wish to insert in the record a table showing the local agencies administering mothers' aid, the States having States supervision, about 22 of them, and the State aid provided by the States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it may be inserted in the record.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

TABLE II.—Administration of mothers' aid and State services and aid

| State                     | Law mandatory or permissive | Administrative agency                                                  | State supervision                                    | State aid                                                                                                                      |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alabama.....              | No special law.             | No mothers' aid law.....                                               | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Alaska.....               | Permissive.....             | Governor.....                                                          | Governor administers.....                            | Territorial appropriation for whole.                                                                                           |
| Arizona.....              | .....do.....                | State department assisted by local agency.                             | State administered.....                              | State appropriation for whole.                                                                                                 |
| Arkansas.....             | .....do.....                | Juvenile and county court.                                             | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| California.....           | .....do.....                | County department or designated agency.                                | By department of social welfare.                     | State may reimburse not to exceed \$120 year per child.                                                                        |
| Colorado.....             | Mandatory.....              | County court.....                                                      | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Connecticut.....          | Permissive.....             | State department assisted by local agency.                             | State administered.....                              | State pays one-third.                                                                                                          |
| Delaware.....             | Mandatory.....              | State mothers' pension commission.                                     | .....do.....                                         | State pays administrative expense and one-half cost of aid.                                                                    |
| District of Columbia..... | .....do.....                | Board of Public Welfare.                                               | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Florida.....              | Permissive.....             | County commissioners.....                                              | Reports.....                                         | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Georgia.....              | No law.....                 | No mothers' aid law.....                                               | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Hawaii.....               | Permissive.....             | Local board of child welfare.                                          | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Idaho.....                | .....do.....                | Probate court.....                                                     | Reports to governor.....                             | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Illinois.....             | Mandatory.....              | County court.....                                                      | State supervision by division of child welfare.      | State appropriation to be allotted 70 percent on population basis and 30 percent according to needs and resources of counties. |
| Indiana.....              | Mandatory.....              | County board of children's guardians.                                  | Reports.....                                         | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Iowa.....                 | .....do.....                | Juvenile court.....                                                    | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Kansas.....               | .....do.....                | County commissioners.....                                              | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Kentucky.....             | Permissible.....            | County children's bureau.                                              | By State children's bureau.                          | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Louisiana.....            | .....do.....                | Parish police jury.....                                                | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Maine.....                | Mandatory.....              | State department and local agency.                                     | Department of health and welfare administers.        | State pays one-half.                                                                                                           |
| Maryland.....             | .....do.....                | County commissioners.....                                              | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Massachusetts.....        | .....do.....                | Town or city board of public welfare.                                  | By department of public welfare.                     | State pays one-third for mothers with settlement; State pays whole amount for mothers without settlement.                      |
| Michigan.....             | .....do.....                | Probate court.....                                                     | Reports.....                                         | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Minnesota.....            | .....do.....                | Juvenile court.....                                                    | General authority given to children's bureau.        | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Mississippi.....          | Permissible.....            | Board or agency appointed by chancery court.                           | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Missouri.....             | .....do.....                | County court.....                                                      | Reports.....                                         | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Montana.....              | Mandatory.....              | County commissioners.....                                              | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Nebraska.....             | .....do.....                | Juvenile court.....                                                    | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Nevada.....               | .....do.....                | County commissioners.....                                              | By State board of charities and public welfare.      | .....                                                                                                                          |
| New Hampshire.....        | .....do.....                | State department.....                                                  | State administered.....                              | State appropriation for whole.                                                                                                 |
| New Jersey.....           | .....do.....                | State department and juvenile court.                                   | State administered.....                              | State pays expense of administration.                                                                                          |
| New Mexico.....           | Permissible.....            | County commissioners and bureau of child welfare.                      | Bureau of child welfare assists with administration. | State pays one-half.                                                                                                           |
| New York.....             | Mandatory.....              | County board of child welfare.                                         | By department of social welfare.                     | .....                                                                                                                          |
| North Carolina.....       | Permissible.....            | County commissioners and county board of charities and public welfare. | By State board of charities and public welfare.      | State may pay one-half but whole appropriation does not exceed \$50,000.                                                       |
| North Dakota.....         | Mandatory.....              | County commissioners.....                                              | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Ohio.....                 | .....do.....                | Juvenile court.....                                                    | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Oklahoma.....             | .....do.....                | County court.....                                                      | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |
| Oregon.....               | .....do.....                | Juvenile and county court.                                             | .....                                                | .....                                                                                                                          |

TABLE II.—Administration of mothers' aid and State services and aid—Continued

| State          | Law mandatory or permissive | Administrative agency                                   | State supervision                 | State aid                                                                                                          |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pennsylvania   | Permissive                  | County board of trustees of mothers' assistance fund.   | By State department of welfare.   | State pays not more than one-half.                                                                                 |
| Puerto Rico    | .....do.....                | Pension board for destitute widowed mothers.            | Pension board administrators.     | Territorial funds for whole.                                                                                       |
| Rhode Island   | .....do.....                | State and local mothers' aid board.                     | State public-welfare commission.  | State pays one-half.                                                                                               |
| South Carolina | No law                      | No mothers' aid law                                     | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| South Dakota   | Mandatory                   | County court                                            | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| Tennessee      | Permissive                  | Juvenile court                                          | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| Texas          | .....do.....                | Commissioners court                                     | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| Utah           | Mandatory                   | County commissioners                                    | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| Vermont        | Permissive                  | State department                                        | State administered                | State pays one-half.                                                                                               |
| Virginia       | .....do.....                | County or city board of public welfare, juvenile court. | By State board of public welfare. | State may pay one third.                                                                                           |
| Washington     | Mandatory                   | Juvenile court                                          | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| West Virginia  | .....do.....                | County court                                            | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |
| Wisconsin      | .....do.....                | Juvenile court                                          | By State board of control.        | State may pay one-third for children with settlement; State may pay entire amount for children without settlement. |
| Wyoming        | Permissive                  | County commissioners                                    | .....                             | .....                                                                                                              |

## SUMMARY

|                      |    |                           |    |
|----------------------|----|---------------------------|----|
| Permissive           | 22 | General county board      | 7  |
| Mandatory            | 27 | No law                    | 10 |
| No law               | 3  | State administrators      | 12 |
| Governor             | 1  | State supervises          | 5  |
| State agency         | 9  | State receives reports    | 4  |
| Juvenile court       | 15 | State finances all        | 1  |
| County commissioners | 13 | State pays administration | 13 |
| Special county board | 4  | State grants-in-aid       |    |

Miss LENROOT. The next point that I want to make is with reference to the standards called for in the bill. Certain very simple standards have been incorporated, requiring, for example, residence of not more than 1 year, and a definition which would be broad enough to include all families where there is only one adult person, and that person needed for the care of children under 16, who is able to work and provide the family with a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health.

There are certain other provisions as to administration, including the fact that this aid must be available in every political subdivision of the State.

There will be a number of changes required in the State laws to bring them up to the standards of the Federal bill. I shall ask leave to insert a table showing the present conditions under which aid may be granted by the States.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

TABLE III.—Conditions under which mothers' aid may be granted

| State                       | Age of child    | Maximum grant for family of 3 children | Conditions other than death of father, under which mothers are eligible | Years of residence |                   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                             |                 |                                        |                                                                         | In State           | In county or town |
| Alaska.....                 | 16              | 55                                     | Deserted, divorced, incapacitated, in penal institution.                | 1                  | -----             |
| Arizona.....                | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Deserted, incapacitated                                                 | 1                  | -----             |
| Arkansas.....               | 15              | 20                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution.                          | -----              | 1                 |
| California.....             | 16              | 60                                     | Incapacitated, in penal institution <sup>1</sup> .....                  | 2                  | -----             |
| Colorado.....               | 18              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother.....                                                         | -----              | -----             |
| Connecticut.....            | 16              | 58, 50                                 | Widows only.....                                                        | 4                  | -----             |
| Delaware.....               | 16              | 28                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution.                          | 3                  | -----             |
| District of Columbia.....   | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother <sup>2</sup> .....                                           | -----              | 1                 |
| Florida.....                | <sup>3</sup> 16 | 41                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>2 4</sup> .....                                  | 2                  | 1                 |
| Hawaii.....                 | -----           | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Deserted, in institution, unable to support. <sup>2</sup>               | -----              | 1                 |
| Idaho.....                  | 15              | 20                                     | In penal or other institution <sup>2</sup> .....                        | 2                  | ( <sup>4</sup> )  |
| Illinois.....               | 16              | <sup>6</sup> 35                        | Deserted, incapacitated.....                                            | -----              | 3                 |
| Indiana.....                | <sup>6</sup> 21 | 67, 50                                 | Any mother.....                                                         | -----              | -----             |
| Iowa.....                   | 16              | 32, 50                                 | In State institution.....                                               | -----              | 1                 |
| Kansas.....                 | 14              | 50                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | 2                  | 1                 |
| Kentucky.....               | <sup>3</sup> 14 | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother <sup>2</sup> .....                                           | 2                  | 2                 |
| Louisiana.....              | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Deserted, incapacitated, penal institution.....                         | 2                  | 1                 |
| Maine.....                  | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother.....                                                         | 5                  | -----             |
| Maryland.....               | <sup>3</sup> 14 | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Incapacitated.....                                                      | -----              | 3                 |
| Massachusetts.....          | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother.....                                                         | 3                  | -----             |
| Michigan.....               | 17              | 60, 67                                 | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | -----              | 1                 |
| Minnesota.....              | 16              | 50                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, State hospital, in penal institution.          | 2                  | 1                 |
| Mississippi.....            | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother <sup>2</sup> .....                                           | -----              | 1                 |
| Missouri.....               | 16              | 32                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | 1                  | 1                 |
| Montana.....                | 16              | 30                                     | Incapacitated, State institution.....                                   | -----              | 1                 |
| Nebraska.....               | 16              | 30                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | -----              | 2                 |
| Nevada.....                 | <sup>3</sup> 16 | 55                                     | Any mother.....                                                         | -----              | 2                 |
| New Hampshire.....          | 16              | 31                                     | Any mother (father may receive grant).                                  | 2                  | -----             |
| New Jersey.....             | <sup>3</sup> 16 | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution. <sup>2</sup>             | -----              | 5                 |
| New Mexico.....             | 16              | 40                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | 2                  | 1                 |
| New York <sup>5</sup> ..... | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution. <sup>2</sup>             | 2                  | -----             |
| North Carolina.....         | 14              | 30                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | 3                  | 1                 |
| North Dakota.....           | 15              | 45                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution.                          | -----              | 1                 |
| Ohio.....                   | <sup>3</sup> 16 | 55                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution.                          | -----              | 2                 |
| Oklahoma.....               | 14              | 20                                     | In State institution for insane, in penal institution.                  | -----              | 1                 |
| Oregon.....                 | <sup>3</sup> 14 | 52                                     | Incapacitated, in institution.....                                      | 3                  | 1                 |
| Pennsylvania.....           | <sup>3</sup> 14 | 40                                     | In hospital for insane.....                                             | 2                  | 1                 |
| Puerto Rico.....            | 16              | 25                                     | Widow.....                                                              | 3                  | -----             |
| Rhode Island.....           | <sup>3</sup> 14 | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Any mother <sup>2</sup> .....                                           | 3                  | 1                 |
| South Dakota.....           | 16              | 42, 50                                 | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | 1                  | ( <sup>4</sup> )  |
| Tennessee.....              | 17              | 35                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution.                          | 2                  | 2                 |
| Texas.....                  | 16              | 27                                     | Divorced, deserted in hospital for insane, in penal institution.        | -----              | 2                 |
| Utah.....                   | 16              | 40                                     | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | -----              | 2                 |
| Vermont.....                | 16              | 26                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in institution.....                            | 2                  | -----             |
| Virginia.....               | 16              | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Broadly inclusive <sup>2 4</sup> .....                                  | 2                  | 1                 |
| Washington.....             | 15              | 25                                     | Any mother.....                                                         | 3                  | 1                 |
| West Virginia.....          | <sup>3</sup> 14 | 45                                     | Deserted, incapacitated.....                                            | 2                  | 1                 |
| Wisconsin.....              | <sup>3</sup> 16 | ( <sup>1</sup> )                       | Broadly inclusive <sup>4</sup> .....                                    | 1                  | -----             |
| Wyoming.....                | 14              | 40                                     | Deserted, incapacitated, in penal institution.                          | -----              | 1                 |

<sup>1</sup> Unlimited.<sup>2</sup> May be granted to guardian.<sup>3</sup> Extension possible.<sup>4</sup> Includes divorced, deserted, physically or mentally incapacitated, in penal institution.<sup>5</sup> 6 months.<sup>6</sup> Except Cook County.<sup>7</sup> Granted to boys under 16 and girls under 17.<sup>8</sup> Citizenship required by law under certain conditions.

Miss LENROOT. I think that about covers the provisions of the bill with reference to mothers' aid.

The bill provides that this section shall be administered by the Federal Relief Administration or by one of its successor agencies, as the President may designate. I think I have explained that the amount of the Federal reimbursement is one-third of the total expenditures.

I should like now to pass to section 703 of the bill, title 7, page 56, "Aid to Child-Welfare Services", because I feel that that is very closely related to the mothers' pension problem. I should like to deal with it before passing on to the child-health features of the bill.

There are many conditions, as I indicated in my opening statement, requiring special social service for children, many situations of extreme neglect in homes, feeble-mindedness in parents and children, cruel and abusive parents, illegitimate children without competent guardians, children who are delinquent and come before the juvenile court, and many other types of problems.

The basic service necessary to deal with these situations is a child-welfare service, which ought to be very closely related to and an integral part of a public-welfare service, and which makes available skilled investigation as to the needs of the child and resources for bringing to meet those needs whatever agencies in the community or the State may be adapted to the particular situation.

Social services for the most part have been developed in the cities, and there has been a great deal of serious neglect in many of the rural areas of the country and the areas suffering from extreme distress and destitution.

In order to meet the situation, 12 States have passed laws providing for county welfare services operated in close relationship to a State welfare agency which can help the counties to organize the service, which can set certain standards as to personnel and administration, and can bring to bear upon the local situation the benefit of a State-wide experience.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee to the fact that whereas mothers' pension laws first developed in our Northern and Eastern States, our more industrial States, it has been in some of the Southern States that very great progress has been made in this county welfare organization. I refer particularly to North Carolina and to Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Miss LENROOT. I have here a table showing the 12 States that have passed these laws, and indicating whether they are permissive or mandatory, and certain features as to the type of legislation and the functions performed by the board. I should like to insert that table in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it may be inserted in the record. (The table referred to is as follows:)

TABLE IV.—States having legislation creating county boards or departments

| State          | Year in-<br>stan-<br>gu-<br>rated | Law mandatory<br>or permissive | Administra-<br>tive responsi-<br>bility vested<br>in— | State financial<br>aid                                                                                         | Employment of county workers                                                        |                                              |                                                | Primary duties of county departments or boards             |                          |                           |                                               |                           |                |        |                                                                            |   |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
|                |                                   |                                |                                                       |                                                                                                                | State approval of<br>appointments                                                   | Extent of em-<br>ployment of<br>paid workers |                                                | Protec-<br>tive<br>work<br>and<br>care of<br>child-<br>ren | Mothers' aid             |                           | Probation<br>(when<br>court<br>re-<br>quests) | School<br>attend-<br>ance | Home<br>relief | Parole | Give<br>assist-<br>ance to<br>State<br>depart-<br>ments<br>on re-<br>quest |   |
|                |                                   |                                |                                                       |                                                                                                                |                                                                                     | Num-<br>ber of<br>count-<br>ies in<br>States | Coun-<br>ties<br>with<br>work-<br>ers,<br>1931 |                                                            | Admin-<br>istra-<br>tion | Assist<br>on re-<br>quest |                                               |                           |                |        |                                                                            |   |
| Alabama        | 1923                              | Permissive                     | Administra-<br>tive board.                            | \$2,000 was avail-<br>able 1927-32<br>from State at-<br>tendance fund<br>for counties<br>employing<br>workers. | Requires certifica-<br>tion of workers<br>by department<br>of child welfare.        | 67                                           | 64                                             | ✓                                                          |                          |                           | ✓                                             |                           |                |        | Ju-<br>venile<br>only.                                                     | ✓ |
| Kentucky       | 1928                              | do.                            | do.                                                   |                                                                                                                | Statute requires<br>approval by<br>State Depart-<br>ment.                           | 120                                          |                                                | ✓                                                          | ✓                        |                           | ✓                                             |                           |                |        | do.                                                                        |   |
| Minnesota      | 1917                              | do.                            | do.                                                   |                                                                                                                | Qualifications fixed<br>by statute, "qual-<br>ified by training<br>and experience." | 87                                           | 12                                             | ✓                                                          | ✓                        |                           | ✓                                             | ✓                         |                |        | ✓                                                                          | ✓ |
| Missouri       | 1921                              | do.                            | Official                                              |                                                                                                                |                                                                                     | 115                                          | (1)                                            | ✓                                                          |                          |                           | ✓                                             | ✓                         |                |        |                                                                            |   |
| Nebraska       | 1931                              | do.                            | Administra-<br>tive board.                            |                                                                                                                |                                                                                     | 93                                           | (1)                                            | ✓                                                          |                          |                           | ✓                                             | ✓                         |                |        |                                                                            |   |
| New York       | 1929                              | Mandatory                      | Official                                              | State aid, accord-<br>ing to popula-<br>tion, from<br>school funds.                                            | Elected official—<br>Approval by State<br>Department.                               | 57                                           | 57                                             | ✓                                                          | ✓                        |                           | ✓                                             | ✓                         | ✓              | ✓      | ✓                                                                          | ✓ |
| North Carolina | 1917                              | do.                            | Advisory<br>board and<br>official.                    |                                                                                                                |                                                                                     | 100                                          | 50                                             |                                                            |                          |                           |                                               |                           |                |        |                                                                            |   |
| South Dakota   | 1921                              | do.                            | Administra-<br>tive board.                            |                                                                                                                | Law makes no<br>provision for<br>paid worker.                                       | 69                                           |                                                | ✓                                                          |                          |                           |                                               |                           |                |        |                                                                            | ✓ |
| Texas          | 1931                              | Permissive                     | do.                                                   |                                                                                                                |                                                                                     |                                              |                                                | ✓                                                          |                          |                           |                                               |                           |                |        |                                                                            | ✓ |



Miss LENROOT. The depression has affected these developing plans for county services very materially, in two ways: In the first place, many of the child-welfare workers that were employed in these States that had developed these county plans were drawn off into emergency relief administration. It was absolutely necessary in time of emergency that this should be done. It was a great contribution to the whole social situation that they were available. Nevertheless, there have been many situations that have suffered as a result of their attention to emergency relief, and as a result of the funds provided being diverted for relief purposes.

I shall digress a minute to point out some of the very extreme conditions from which children are suffering—for example, the great increase in some States of the use of almshouses for children, a practice that was condemned over 100 years ago. That is one side of the picture of the effect of the depression upon these county welfare services. The other side of the picture is that the emergency relief administrations, by going into every county in the United States and bringing at least to a certain extent trained social service to these places that have never known it before, have greatly increased public recognition of the need for social services of this kind and the values that were inherent in this form of plan. So that we now have at least 14 States without this type of legislation that are seriously considering this year enactment of legislation for strengthening these county welfare services.

However, the resources of the States for giving encouragement and aid to these services and for exercising the older functions of State welfare departments with reference to the protection of children have been greatly curtailed by the financial situation and the necessity of the States for putting as much money as possible into emergency relief funds.

I have here a table showing the expenditures or appropriations for State welfare departments or bureaus concerned with child welfare, exclusive of funds for direct maintenance of children. This shows a decrease of 12.4 percent in the appropriations between 1932 and 1934 for the States for which we have reports. We have no reports as yet for New York State.

The total amount of money expended for State welfare service to children, exclusive of child placing and maintenance of children in institutions in 1934, is estimated as \$2,125,000, exclusive of New York State. I would like to file that table.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it may be inserted in the record.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

TABLE V.—Expenditures or appropriations for State welfare departments, bureaus, or divisions concerned with child welfare, exclusive of funds for State aid and maintenance of children

| State               | Agency                                                                     | Funds for 1932 <sup>1</sup> | Funds for 1934 <sup>1</sup> | Percentage change 1932-34 |           |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
|                     |                                                                            |                             |                             | In-crease or same         | De-crease |
| Total.....          |                                                                            | \$ 2,426,804                | \$ 2,125,686                |                           | 12.4      |
| Alabama.....        | Child-welfare department.....                                              | 55,105 E                    | 42,933 E                    |                           | 22.1      |
| Arizona.....        | Board of public welfare.....                                               | 18,270 A                    | 6,560 A                     |                           | 64.1      |
| Arkansas.....       | No State department.....                                                   |                             |                             |                           |           |
| California.....     | Department of social welfare.....                                          | 150,024 A                   | 72,331 A                    |                           | 51.9      |
| Colorado.....       | Child-welfare bureau.....                                                  | 7,784 A                     | 6,700 A                     |                           | 13.9      |
| Connecticut.....    | Child-welfare bureau, department of public welfare.....                    | 120,928 E                   | 111,277 E                   |                           | 14.4      |
| Delaware.....       | State board of charities.....                                              | 3,000 A                     | 5,500 A                     | 83.3                      |           |
| Florida.....        | Board of public welfare.....                                               | 16,560 A                    | 13,440 A                    |                           | 18.8      |
| Georgia.....        | Department of public welfare.....                                          | 30,000 A                    | 20,000 A                    |                           | 33.3      |
| Idaho.....          | No division for children's work.....                                       |                             |                             |                           |           |
| Illinois.....       | Division of child welfare, department of public welfare.....               | 68,752 E                    | 38,685 E                    |                           | 43.7      |
| Indiana.....        | Board of State charities.....                                              | 49,700 A                    | 42,400 A                    |                           | 14.6      |
| Iowa.....           | Child welfare division, board of control.....                              | <sup>2</sup> 18,078 A       | 17,730 A                    |                           | 1.9       |
| Kansas.....         | No division for children's work.....                                       |                             |                             |                           |           |
| Kentucky.....       | Children's bureau.....                                                     | 10,000 A                    | 9,000 A                     |                           | 10.0      |
| Louisiana.....      | Board of charities and corrections.....                                    | 7,500 A                     | 7,500 A                     | Same                      |           |
| Maine.....          | Bureau of social service, department of health and welfare.....            | 80,500 A                    | 86,764 A                    | 7.8                       |           |
| Maryland.....       | Board of State aid and charities.....                                      | 13,450 A                    | 9,187 A                     |                           | 31.6      |
| Massachusetts.....  | Division of child guardianship, department of public welfare. <sup>4</sup> | 408,006 E                   | 495,000 A                   | 21.3                      |           |
| Michigan.....       | Department of public welfare.....                                          | 84,085 E                    | 84,000 E                    | Same                      |           |
| Minnesota.....      | Children's bureau, board of control.....                                   | 56,670 E                    | 48,672 E                    |                           | 14.1      |
| Mississippi.....    | No State department.....                                                   |                             |                             |                           |           |
| Missouri.....       | State children's bureau.....                                               | 40,515 E                    | 30,870 E                    |                           | 37.6      |
| Montana.....        | Bureau of child protection.....                                            | 13,275 A                    | 10,380 A                    |                           | 21.8      |
| Nebraska.....       | Bureau of child welfare.....                                               | 10,000 A                    | 7,750 A                     |                           | 22.5      |
| Nevada.....         | No division for children's work.....                                       |                             |                             |                           |           |
| New Hampshire.....  | Board of public welfare.....                                               | 37,225 A                    | 36,912 A                    |                           | .8        |
| New Jersey.....     | State board of children's guardians.....                                   | 315,900 A                   | 287,419 A                   | 8.9                       |           |
| New Mexico.....     | Bureau of child welfare.....                                               | 30,299 E                    | 26,482 E                    |                           | 12.5      |
| New York.....       | Division of child welfare, department of social welfare.....               | ( <sup>3</sup> )            | ( <sup>3</sup> )            |                           |           |
| North Carolina..... | Board of charities and public welfare.....                                 | 31,443 E                    | 28,360 A                    |                           | 9.8       |
| North Dakota.....   | Children's bureau.....                                                     | 6,170 A                     | 4,455 A                     |                           | 27.8      |
| Ohio.....           | Division of charities.....                                                 | 160,173 A                   | 99,200 A                    |                           | 41.3      |
| Oklahoma.....       | Department of charities and corrections.....                               | 14,350 A                    | 8,470 A                     |                           | 40.9      |
| Oregon.....         | Child welfare commission.....                                              | 13,440 A                    | 9,455 A                     |                           | 29.6      |
| Pennsylvania.....   | Department of welfare.....                                                 | 297,500 A                   | 235,000 A                   |                           | 21.0      |
| Rhode Island.....   | Children's bureau, department of public welfare. <sup>4</sup>              | 43,926 E                    | 44,235 E                    | 0.7                       |           |
| South Carolina..... | Children's bureau. <sup>4</sup>                                            | 9,561 A                     | 5,482 A                     |                           | 42.7      |
| South Dakota.....   | Child welfare commission.....                                              | 6,000 A                     | 4,000 A                     |                           | 33.3      |
| Tennessee.....      | Welfare division, department of institutions.....                          | 6,938 A                     | None                        |                           |           |
| Texas.....          | Child welfare division.....                                                | 20,100 A                    | 13,580 A                    |                           | 32.4      |
| Utah.....           | No State department.....                                                   |                             |                             |                           |           |
| Vermont.....        | Department of public welfare.....                                          | 18,000 A                    | 24,000 A                    | 33.3                      |           |
| Virginia.....       | Children's bureau, department of public welfare.....                       | 39,497 E                    | 34,856 E                    |                           | 11.7      |
| Washington.....     | No staff in children's division.....                                       |                             |                             |                           |           |
| West Virginia.....  | Department of public welfare.....                                          | 46,750 A                    | 52,700 A                    |                           |           |
| Wisconsin.....      | Juvenile department, board of control.....                                 | 32,580 E                    | 31,151 E                    |                           | 4.3       |
| Wyoming.....        | Board of charities and reform.....                                         | 7,750 A                     | 13,250 A                    | 70.9                      |           |

<sup>1</sup> A, appropriation; E, expenditures.<sup>2</sup> Total exclusive of New York, for which information not reported.<sup>3</sup> 1932-33 appropriation.<sup>4</sup> Bureau or division doing child placing mainly.<sup>5</sup> No report.

Miss LENROOT. This act provides an appropriation of \$1,500,000 to be made available for aid to State welfare departments, especially for strengthening and extending public-welfare services in rural areas and areas suffering from severe economic distress. These services contemplate the care and protection of homeless, neglected and dependent children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent. The money is to be divided as follows: One million dollars to be allotted, \$10,000 to each State, and the balance on a population basis, all this to be granted on a matching basis; and about \$425,000, if we deduct the maximum allowed for Federal administration, to be used in helping States in severe economic distress to match the funds, using their own funds, and this additional allotment.

I have here a table showing the apportionment to each State under this title. The amounts of money would range from something slightly over \$10,000 to a maximum of \$58,000 per year. With the permission of the committee, I shall file this table.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it may be inserted in the record. (The table referred to is as follows:)

TABLE VI.—Apportionment under title VII, section 703, aid to child welfare services

| State                     | Total apportionment—\$480,000 plus \$10,000 allotment | Apportionment of \$480,000 distributed on basis of population | State               | Total apportionment—\$480,000 plus \$10,000 allotment | Apportionment of \$480,000 distributed on basis of population |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Total.....                | \$1,000,000.00                                        | \$480,000.00                                                  | Missouri.....       | \$23,965.08                                           | \$13,965.08                                                   |
| Alabama.....              | 20,182.24                                             | 10,182.24                                                     | Montana.....        | 12,068.60                                             | 2,068.60                                                      |
| Alaska.....               | 10,228.09                                             | 228.09                                                        | Nebraska.....       | 15,302.13                                             | 5,302.13                                                      |
| Arizona.....              | 11,676.00                                             | 1,676.00                                                      | Nevada.....         | 10,350.37                                             | 350.37                                                        |
| Arkansas.....             | 17,135.68                                             | 7,135.68                                                      | New Hampshire.....  | 11,790.36                                             | 1,790.36                                                      |
| California.....           | 31,844.93                                             | 21,844.93                                                     | New Jersey.....     | 25,550.25                                             | 15,550.25                                                     |
| Colorado.....             | 13,985.52                                             | 3,985.52                                                      | New Mexico.....     | 11,628.84                                             | 1,628.84                                                      |
| Connecticut.....          | 16,183.04                                             | 6,183.04                                                      | New York.....       | 58,436.37                                             | 48,436.37                                                     |
| Delaware.....             | 10,917.24                                             | 917.24                                                        | North Carolina..... | 22,198.59                                             | 12,198.59                                                     |
| District of Columbia..... | 11,873.38                                             | 1,873.38                                                      | North Dakota.....   | 12,619.76                                             | 2,619.76                                                      |
| Florida.....              | 15,649.38                                             | 5,649.38                                                      | Ohio.....           | 35,575.17                                             | 25,575.17                                                     |
| Georgia.....              | 21,191.35                                             | 11,191.35                                                     | Oklahoma.....       | 19,219.48                                             | 9,219.48                                                      |
| Hawaii.....               | 11,417.28                                             | 1,417.28                                                      | Oregon.....         | 13,669.98                                             | 3,669.98                                                      |
| Idaho.....                | 11,712.40                                             | 1,712.40                                                      | Pennsylvania.....   | 47,059.52                                             | 37,059.52                                                     |
| Illinois.....             | 39,361.24                                             | 29,361.24                                                     | Puerto Rico.....    | 15,940.67                                             | 5,940.67                                                      |
| Indiana.....              | 22,461.12                                             | 12,461.12                                                     | Rhode Island.....   | 12,645.35                                             | 2,645.35                                                      |
| Iowa.....                 | 19,507.68                                             | 9,507.68                                                      | South Carolina..... | 16,690.42                                             | 6,690.42                                                      |
| Kansas.....               | 17,237.71                                             | 7,237.71                                                      | South Dakota.....   | 12,665.94                                             | 2,665.94                                                      |
| Kentucky.....             | 20,060.42                                             | 10,060.42                                                     | Tennessee.....      | 20,067.99                                             | 10,067.99                                                     |
| Louisiana.....            | 18,086.51                                             | 8,086.51                                                      | Texas.....          | 32,412.35                                             | 22,412.35                                                     |
| Maine.....                | 13,068.32                                             | 3,068.32                                                      | Utah.....           | 11,954.09                                             | 1,954.09                                                      |
| Maryland.....             | 16,277.79                                             | 6,277.79                                                      | Vermont.....        | 11,383.71                                             | 1,383.71                                                      |
| Massachusetts.....        | 26,351.67                                             | 16,351.67                                                     | Virginia.....       | 19,318.80                                             | 9,318.80                                                      |
| Michigan.....             | 28,632.30                                             | 18,632.30                                                     | Washington.....     | 16,015.64                                             | 6,015.64                                                      |
| Minnesota.....            | 19,865.58                                             | 9,865.58                                                      | West Virginia.....  | 16,653.64                                             | 6,653.64                                                      |
| Mississippi.....          | 17,733.39                                             | 7,733.39                                                      | Wisconsin.....      | 21,308.71                                             | 11,308.71                                                     |
|                           |                                                       |                                                               | Wyoming.....        | 10,867.93                                             | 867.93                                                        |

Miss LENROOT. Aid is to be granted after plans have been submitted from the State agencies of welfare, which plans must include reasonable provision for State administration, State financial participation, furthering local public welfare services, and cooperation with health and welfare groups and organizations. Of course, it will be necessary to develop this service in very close relation to the public welfare programs of the States and the local communities.

Now I shall pass to the child and maternal health sections of the bill, title 7, section 701, making available \$4,000,000 in order to enable the Government to cooperate with the State agencies of health in

extending and strengthening services for the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from severe economic distress.

The Children's Bureau, ever since the depression began, has been keeping in touch as best it could with situations affecting the health of children, and accumulating as much information as could be made available concerning the effect of the depression on child health. During the past year, representatives of the Children's Bureau's Child and Maternal Health Division have been in every State of the Union, and have talked with State officials and local officials, and voluntary groups and individuals. We have also made home visits to families in several communities for the purpose of talking with mothers and finding out for ourselves what the mothers' own experiences have been as to the effect of the depression on child health and on child welfare.

The infant and maternal mortality rates also give some indication of the situation. We have had a falling infant mortality rate in this country, but between 1932 and 1933, there was not the usual decrease. The rate remains stationary.

I have here a map showing the infant mortality in the United States in 1933, which I should like to exhibit as indicating the great variation between States and the areas where special service is needed. The black States have rates of 90 or more infant deaths per thousand live births. The purple States have rates ranging from 65 to 89 infant deaths per thousand live births. In contrast with that is the red State up here in the corner, Washington, that has a rate of less than 40, and the yellow States that have rates of 40 to 54.

Would you like to have that map go in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. So far as practicable it will be put in the record. (The map above referred to is on file with the committee.)

Miss LENROOT. Advance figures made available by the Public Health Service for 26 States for the first 6 months of 1934, show a more discouraging situation. It appears that the rate not only is stationary, but has begun to rise. For these 26 States, the rate for the first 6 months of 1934 was 62, as compared with 59 for the same group of States in 1933, and 58 in 1932.

The maternal mortality picture is similar. I have here a map showing the maternal mortality, that is, the number of deaths of mothers assigned to causes related to childbirth per 10,000 live births. Here again the black is the highest, with rates of 90 and over, and the red is the lowest. I will leave that with the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it go in. The same action will be taken with this map as with the other.

(The map above referred to is on file with the committee.)

Miss LENROOT. It is well known that the death rate among mothers has not decreased in anything like the proportion that the death rate among infants has decreased. This fact is one of the things that causes us to feel that increased facilities for maternal care and maternity nursing services are essential, not only for saving the lives of mothers, who are so necessary for their families, not only for the new-born babies that may survive, but also the older children in the families, and also for safeguarding the lives of the infants, for we have made much less progress in reducing the death rate within the first month of life than we have in reducing the death rate from

1 to 11 months of life. The death rates during the first month of life are very closely associated with the causes leading to maternal deaths.

One of the most effective ways of reaching the problem of infant and maternal mortality is the development of public health nursing services, because it is through these services that the mothers are made to realize in the first place what kind of medical attention is needed and how important it is to place themselves under the care of a physician early in pregnancy; also, it is through the public-health nurse that the mother learns how to take care of the baby and to give the child the best possible start in life.

The other factors, of course, which are highly important are the development of better methods of obstetrical care and other technical questions relating to our maternal health service in this country.

The very great need for improvement along these lines has been indicated by reports of studies of maternal mortality made by the Children's Bureaus in 15 States, and also made in other States and localities, notably New York and Philadelphia, by local groups.

I have figures here showing that for 24 States where we know that the situation is probably better than average—that is, in this group of 24 States, many of the States with the most inadequate nursing service are not represented—but in this group of States we have information as to the number of counties without any permanent county-wide public-health nursing service whatever, and we have information as to the population living in these counties without service. The table shows that of 1,017 rural counties in the 24 States, there were only 370, or a little over a third, with any permanent county-wide nursing service, and that might mean only one nurse; the other 54 percent of the population living in these rural counties was living in counties without any such nursing service.

I shall ask leave to file that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it may be inserted in the record.

(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE VII.—*Permanent public-health nursing service in the counties of 24 States, 1934*<sup>1</sup>

|                                               | Number of counties | Population <sup>2</sup> of counties |                      |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
|                                               |                    | Number                              | Percent distribution |
| Total counties in States.....                 | 1,393              |                                     |                      |
| Permanent nursing service.....                | 835                |                                     |                      |
| County-wide service.....                      | 638                |                                     |                      |
| Local service only.....                       | 197                |                                     |                      |
| No permanent nursing service.....             | 558                |                                     |                      |
| Total rural counties in States.....           | 1,017              | 19,630,274                          | 100                  |
| Permanent county-wide nursing service.....    | 370                | 9,036,336                           | 46                   |
| No permanent county-wide nursing service..... | 647                | 10,593,938                          | 54                   |

<sup>1</sup> Compiled from data received by United States Children's Bureau from State health departments.

<sup>2</sup> Population—1930 United States Census.

Miss LENROOT. Another very important aspect of the maternal and child-health program is the provision of health centers where mothers can go for advice, consultation, and examination, both in the prenatal period and with the children after the children are born. These are developed in very close relation to the public-health nursing services. We have figures as to the number of prenatal and child-health centers in the counties of 18 States in 1934, and here again these 18 States do not represent the most needy group. They represent States from which we can easily get information. In the urban counties of those States, 55 percent have prenatal or child-health centers, but in the rural counties only 11 percent have such centers. The bill, as you note, gives particular attention to the need for extending these services in rural areas.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be admitted.

(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE VIII.—*Permanent prenatal and child-health centers in the counties of 18 States, 1934*<sup>1</sup>

|                                                | Number of<br>counties | Percent dis-<br>tribution |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Total counties.....                            | 982                   | 100                       |
| Prenatal and child-health centers.....         | 220                   | 22                        |
| Both prenatal and child-health centers.....    | 137                   |                           |
| Prenatal centers only.....                     | 6                     |                           |
| Child-health centers only.....                 | 77                    |                           |
| Neither prenatal nor child-health centers..... | 762                   | 78                        |
| Urban counties.....                            | 261                   | 100                       |
| Prenatal and child-health centers.....         | 144                   | 55                        |
| Both prenatal and child-health centers.....    | 97                    |                           |
| Prenatal centers only.....                     | 4                     |                           |
| Child-health centers only.....                 | 43                    |                           |
| Neither prenatal nor child-health centers..... | 117                   | 45                        |
| Rural counties.....                            | 721                   | 100                       |
| Prenatal and child-health centers.....         | 76                    | 11                        |
| Both prenatal and child-health centers.....    | 40                    |                           |
| Prenatal centers only.....                     | 2                     |                           |
| Child-health centers only.....                 | 34                    |                           |
| Neither prenatal nor child-health centers..... | 645                   | 89                        |

<sup>1</sup> Compiled from data received by U. S. Children's Bureau from State health departments.

Miss LENROOT. Yesterday the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service sent me a very interesting table showing the extent to which mothers had had prenatal care in a group of maternity cases reported by visiting nurses. Of course, these cases would be a selected group of cases, because there were visiting nurses available in the community to get in touch with the mothers.

Among the mothers included in the study who lived in cities, 37 percent of those who had no prenatal service did not have it because they did not consider it necessary, whereas in the towns and rural areas 80 percent fell in this group.

We have also some evidence that has been collected very recently by the Children's Bureau through the cooperation of the public health

nursing agencies in 25 cities. These nurses reported the conditions of the children that they visited on one day in November. We have tabulated the reports based on the nurses' and the mothers' observation for 3,500 of these families under care of nursing agencies.

The number of children reported as having defects that needed attention was 31 percent of the total number. This is not based on medical examination, which would have revealed a great many defects not obvious to the mothers and the nurses. Treatment was not arranged for in almost half of the cases reported as having defects. In 833 of the approximately 1,300 cases for which treatment was not arranged for, the reason given was financial distress. In other words, these 833 children were not receiving attention because of financial conditions.

I should like to insert that in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that will be inserted in the record.

(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE IX.—*Physical defects or conditions needing attention as reported by mother to visiting nurse among 9,472 children included in 3,500 families under the care of public health nursing agencies in 25 cities, November 1934*

| Physical defects or conditions<br>needing attention | Age of child |                                   |              |                                   |                          |                                   |                            |                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                                                     | Total        |                                   | Under 1 year |                                   | 1 year, under<br>6 years |                                   | 6 years, under<br>10 years |                                   |
|                                                     | Num-<br>ber  | Per-<br>cent<br>distrib-<br>ution | Num-<br>ber  | Per-<br>cent<br>distrib-<br>ution | Num-<br>ber              | Per-<br>cent<br>distrib-<br>ution | Num-<br>ber                | Per-<br>cent<br>distrib-<br>ution |
| Total children.....                                 | 9,472        | 100                               | 1,238        | 100                               | 3,509                    | 100                               | 4,725                      | 100                               |
| No defects.....                                     | 6,557        | 69                                | 1,059        | 86                                | 2,558                    | 73                                | 2,940                      | 62                                |
| Defects.....                                        | 2,915        | 31                                | 179          | 14                                | 951                      | 27                                | 1,785                      | 38                                |
| Treatment reported.....                             | 2,833        | -----                             | 172          | -----                             | 928                      | -----                             | 1,733                      | -----                             |
| Treatment arranged for.....                         | 1,497        | -----                             | 145          | -----                             | 504                      | -----                             | 848                        | -----                             |
| Treatment not arranged for<br>because of—           | 1,336        | -----                             | 27           | -----                             | 424                      | -----                             | 885                        | -----                             |
| Financial reasons.....                              | 833          | -----                             | 9            | -----                             | 240                      | -----                             | 584                        | -----                             |
| Other reasons.....                                  | 403          | -----                             | 15           | -----                             | 153                      | -----                             | 235                        | -----                             |
| Reasons not reported.....                           | 100          | -----                             | 3            | -----                             | 31                       | -----                             | 66                         | -----                             |
| Treatment not reported.....                         | 82           | -----                             | 7            | -----                             | 23                       | -----                             | 52                         | -----                             |

Miss LENROOT. Another table based on this same group shows the adequacy of milk supply in these families, and shows that in the total group 56 percent of the families were receiving less than 50 percent of the milk estimated to be necessary on the basis given in the table. We divided these families into families receiving relief and families not receiving relief. Sixty-four percent of the families receiving relief had a milk supply less than 50 percent adequate as compared with 49 percent of the families not receiving relief.

May I file that?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be inserted in the record.  
(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE X.—*Adequacy of milk supply in 3,500 families under the care of public-health nursing agencies in 25 cities, November 1934*

## ADEQUACY OF MILK SUPPLY FOR FAMILY

|                                                            | Families |                      |                  |                      |                      |                      | Not reported whether receiving relief |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                                                            | Total    |                      | Receiving relief |                      | Not receiving relief |                      |                                       |
|                                                            | Number   | Percent distribution | Number           | Percent distribution | Number               | Percent distribution |                                       |
| Total families.....                                        | 3, 500   |                      | 1, 526           |                      | 1, 828               |                      | 146                                   |
| Total reported.....                                        | 3, 459   | 100                  | 1, 511           | 100                  | 1, 805               | 100                  | 143                                   |
| More than adequate.....                                    | 197      | 6                    | 50               | 3                    | 141                  | 8                    | 6                                     |
| Adequate.....                                              | 53       | 2                    | 15               | 1                    | 38                   | 2                    |                                       |
| Inadequate.....                                            | 3, 209   | 93                   | 1, 446           | 96                   | 1, 626               | 90                   | 137                                   |
| 75 percent, less than 100 percent of amount necessary..... | 365      | 11                   | 134              | 9                    | 217                  | 12                   | 14                                    |
| 50 percent, less than 75 percent of amount necessary.....  | 908      | 26                   | 355              | 23                   | 520                  | 29                   | 33                                    |
| 25 percent, less than 50 percent of amount necessary.....  | 997      | 29                   | 438              | 29                   | 526                  | 29                   | 33                                    |
| Less than 25 percent of amount necessary.....              | 809      | 23                   | 431              | 29                   | 331                  | 18                   | 47                                    |
| No milk.....                                               | 130      | 4                    | 88               | 6                    | 32                   | 2                    | 10                                    |
| Not reported.....                                          | 41       |                      | 15               |                      | 23                   |                      | 3                                     |

## ADEQUACY OF MILK FOR CHILDREN UNDER 6 YEARS OF AGE IF ALL TAKEN BY FAMILY HAD BEEN USED FOR CHILDREN OF THIS AGE

|                                                    |       |     |       |     |       |     |     |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Total families.....                                | 3,500 |     | 1,526 |     | 1,828 |     | 146 |
| Total reported.....                                | 2,295 | 100 | 1,078 | 100 | 1,115 | 100 | 102 |
| Adequate.....                                      | 1,263 | 55  | 525   | 49  | 692   | 62  | 46  |
| Inadequate.....                                    | 1,032 | 45  | 553   | 51  | 423   | 38  | 56  |
| Not reported.....                                  | 27    |     | 9     |     | 16    |     | 2   |
| No children under 6, or nursing children only..... | 1,178 |     | 439   |     | 697   |     | 42  |

Adequacy of milk supply determined by standard:

*Amount of milk necessary per week, quarts*

|                                    |     |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Children under 1 year:             |     |
| If mother is nursing.....          | 0   |
| If mother not nursing.....         | 7   |
| Children 1 to 5 years.....         | 7   |
| 6 to 15 years.....                 | 5   |
| 16 to 20 years.....                | 5   |
| Adult not pregnant or nursing..... | 3.5 |
| Adult pregnant or nursing.....     | 7   |

Miss LENROOT. I have a table from Pennsylvania showing the extent of malnutrition found in very careful and extensive examinations of children made through a Statewide plan for having these medical examinations made, worked out largely by the medical profession. There were 30 percent of the children who were found to be suffering from malnutrition. I do not want to elaborate on some of these points. If the committee wishes further information as to the extent of malnutrition—and we have had reports showing it has considerably increased in many places—such reports can be furnished later on.

To meet these situations, the bill provides \$1,040,000 to be allotted \$20,000 to each State and another million dollars to be distributed among the States in the proportion which the number of live births in each State bears to the total number of live births in the United States, making a total of \$2,040,000 that would be available if the States matched this amount of money by equal State appropriations.

However, realizing the extent to which State appropriations have been curtailed, an amount of \$800,000 is included to be allotted by the Secretary of Labor in her discretion to States unable because of severe economic distress to match the amounts in full.

I have here a chart showing the extent to which the child-health appropriations in the States have decreased during the depression period and indicating the necessity for this \$800,000 discretionary fund. The red shows the amount of money available in 1932, and the blue shows the amount of money available in 1934. You will see that in almost every case the blue line is a considerably shorter line than the red line.

I do not know whether you care for that table or not. I have a table here that perhaps would meet the point. In fact, a table was inserted in the record by Dr. Witte yesterday, which shows the amounts of the appropriations available to the States and the decreases, so that it probably would not be necessary to insert additional information.

We have estimated in this table, which I shall ask leave to file, the amounts that would be available under the matching provisions of this section with the present State appropriations. That is, unless the States increase their appropriations they would be over a million dollars short in ability to match the funds made available under the matching section. We shall hope, of course, that the States this year will increase somewhat their State appropriations, but it is clear that at least an amount of \$800,000 will be necessary for a reserve fund in order to make sure that these services can be made available.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the table will be inserted in the record.

(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE XI.—*Apportionment under title VII, Maternal and Child Health, sec. 701, compared with State funds available in 1934*

| State                     | 1934 State funds for maternal and child-health work | Total apportionment under title VII, sec. 701 | Excess of total apportionment over State funds | Excess of State funds over total apportionment |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Alabama.....              | \$2,520.00                                          | \$47,478.45                                   | \$44,958.45                                    | -----                                          |
| Alaska.....               | -----                                               | 20,592.75                                     | 20,592.75                                      | -----                                          |
| Arizona.....              | 12,890.00                                           | 23,762.55                                     | 10,872.55                                      | -----                                          |
| Arkansas.....             | -----                                               | 36,578.39                                     | 36,578.39                                      | -----                                          |
| California.....           | 12,225.00                                           | 54,747.93                                     | 42,522.93                                      | -----                                          |
| Colorado.....             | -----                                               | 27,955.77                                     | 27,955.77                                      | -----                                          |
| Connecticut.....          | 29,392.00                                           | 30,390.20                                     | 998.20                                         | -----                                          |
| Delaware.....             | 33,000.00                                           | 21,816.21                                     | -----                                          | \$11,183.79                                    |
| District of Columbia..... | 44,000.00                                           | 24,610.00                                     | -----                                          | 19,390.00                                      |
| Florida.....              | 7,330.00                                            | 31,885.50                                     | 24,555.50                                      | -----                                          |
| Georgia.....              | 26,000.00                                           | 48,240.68                                     | 22,240.68                                      | -----                                          |
| Hawaii.....               | 4,100.00                                            | 24,859.14                                     | 20,759.14                                      | -----                                          |
| Idaho.....                | 1,430.00                                            | 23,962.61                                     | 22,532.61                                      | -----                                          |
| Illinois.....             | 69,070.00                                           | 69,971.34                                     | 901.34                                         | -----                                          |
| Indiana.....              | -----                                               | 43,376.45                                     | 43,376.45                                      | -----                                          |
| Iowa.....                 | 6,600.00                                            | 38,326.53                                     | 31,726.53                                      | -----                                          |
| Kansas.....               | 8,000.00                                            | 34,242.13                                     | 26,242.13                                      | -----                                          |

TABLE XI.—*Apportionment under title VII, Maternal and Child Health, sec. 701, compared with State funds available in 1934—Continued*

| State                          | 1934 State funds for maternal and child-health work | Total apportionment under title VII sec. 701 | Excess of total apportionment over State funds | Excess of State funds over total apportionment |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Kentucky.....                  | \$25,200.00                                         | \$45,620.09                                  | \$20,420.09                                    | -----                                          |
| Louisiana.....                 | 7,000.00                                            | 38,406.64                                    | 31,406.62                                      | -----                                          |
| Maine.....                     | 26,300.00                                           | 27,003.21                                    | 703.21                                         | -----                                          |
| Maryland.....                  | 26,844.00                                           | 32,707.01                                    | 5,863.01                                       | -----                                          |
| Massachusetts.....             | 80,850.00                                           | 49,380.33                                    | -----                                          | \$31,469.67                                    |
| Michigan.....                  | 31,940.00                                           | 57,474.10                                    | 25,534.10                                      | -----                                          |
| Minnesota.....                 | 36,000.00                                           | 40,613.70                                    | 4,613.70                                       | -----                                          |
| Mississippi.....               | 15,150.00                                           | 40,602.56                                    | 25,352.56                                      | -----                                          |
| Missouri.....                  | 23,799.00                                           | 46,524.03                                    | 22,725.03                                      | -----                                          |
| Montana.....                   | 10,500.00                                           | 24,145.99                                    | 13,645.99                                      | -----                                          |
| Nebraska.....                  | -----                                               | 31,199.67                                    | 31,199.67                                      | -----                                          |
| Nevada.....                    | -----                                               | 20,626.55                                    | 20,626.55                                      | -----                                          |
| New Hampshire.....             | 21,620.00                                           | 23,419.87                                    | 1,799.87                                       | -----                                          |
| New Jersey.....                | 103,872.00                                          | 45,969.92                                    | -----                                          | 57,911.08                                      |
| New Mexico.....                | -----                                               | 25,697.78                                    | 25,697.78                                      | -----                                          |
| New York.....                  | 134,500.00                                          | 106,669.77                                   | -----                                          | 27,830.23                                      |
| North Carolina.....            | 18,500.00                                           | 54,926.68                                    | 36,426.68                                      | -----                                          |
| North Dakota.....              | 3,056.00                                            | 26,107.61                                    | 23,051.61                                      | -----                                          |
| Ohio.....                      | 10,048.00                                           | 64,355.52                                    | 54,307.52                                      | -----                                          |
| Oklahoma.....                  | -----                                               | 40,235.36                                    | 40,235.36                                      | -----                                          |
| Oregon.....                    | 4,701.00                                            | 25,660.27                                    | 20,959.27                                      | -----                                          |
| Pennsylvania.....              | 197,539.00                                          | 92,725.40                                    | -----                                          | 104,813.60                                     |
| Puerto Rico <sup>1</sup> ..... | 8,612.22                                            | 50,764.02                                    | 42,151.80                                      | -----                                          |
| Rhode Island.....              | 24,065.00                                           | 24,793.84                                    | 728.84                                         | -----                                          |
| South Carolina.....            | 2,046.00                                            | 38,671.06                                    | 36,625.06                                      | -----                                          |
| South Dakota.....              | 5,000.00                                            | 25,954.79                                    | 20,954.79                                      | -----                                          |
| Tennessee.....                 | 2,912.00                                            | 43,222.71                                    | 40,310.71                                      | -----                                          |
| Texas.....                     | 34,840.00                                           | 69,989.86                                    | 35,149.86                                      | -----                                          |
| Utah.....                      | -----                                               | 25,515.32                                    | 25,515.32                                      | -----                                          |
| Vermont.....                   | -----                                               | 22,839.16                                    | 22,839.16                                      | -----                                          |
| Virginia.....                  | 40,372.00                                           | 43,734.88                                    | 3,362.88                                       | -----                                          |
| Washington.....                | 3,000.00                                            | 29,670.11                                    | 26,670.11                                      | -----                                          |
| West Virginia.....             | 9,140.00                                            | 36,792.80                                    | 27,652.80                                      | -----                                          |
| Wisconsin.....                 | 43,350.00                                           | 43,343.57                                    | -----                                          | 6.43                                           |
| Wyoming.....                   | 2,500.00                                            | 21,948.19                                    | 19,448.19                                      | -----                                          |
| Total.....                     | 1,209,813.22                                        | 2,040,000.00                                 | 1,082,791.58                                   | -----                                          |

<sup>1</sup> For Bureau of Child Hygiene fiscal year 1933-34.

Miss LENROOT. I have also a table showing the apportionment and the amount of money that each State would be entitled to under this section of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be inserted in the record. (The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE XII.—*Apportionment under title VII, Maternal and Child Health, sec. 701*

| State                     | Total apportionment \$1,000,000 plus \$20,000 allotment | Apportionment of \$1,000,000 distributed on the basis of live births reported in 1933 <sup>1</sup> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Total.....                | \$2,040,000.00                                          | \$1,000,000.00                                                                                     |
| Alabama.....              | 47,478.45                                               | 27,478.45                                                                                          |
| Alaska.....               | 20,592.75                                               | 592.75                                                                                             |
| Arizona.....              | 23,762.55                                               | 3,762.55                                                                                           |
| Arkansas.....             | 36,578.39                                               | 16,578.39                                                                                          |
| California.....           | 54,747.93                                               | 34,747.93                                                                                          |
| Colorado.....             | 27,955.77                                               | 7,955.77                                                                                           |
| Connecticut.....          | 30,390.20                                               | 10,390.20                                                                                          |
| Delaware.....             | 21,816.21                                               | 1,816.21                                                                                           |
| District of Columbia..... | 24,610.00                                               | 4,610.00                                                                                           |
| Florida.....              | 31,885.50                                               | 11,885.50                                                                                          |
| Georgia.....              | 48,240.68                                               | 28,240.68                                                                                          |
| Hawaii.....               | 24,859.14                                               | 4,859.14                                                                                           |
| Idaho.....                | 23,962.61                                               | 3,962.61                                                                                           |

<sup>1</sup> Alaska apportionment based on live births reported for the 2-year period 1931-32; Hawaii and Puerto Rico, 1932.

TABLE XII.—*Apportionment under title VII, Maternal and Child Health, sec. 701—Continued*

| State               | Total apportionment \$1,000,000 plus \$20,000 allotment | Apportionment of \$1,000,000 distributed on the basis of live births reported in 1933 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Illinois.....       | \$69,971.34                                             | \$49,971.34                                                                           |
| Indiana.....        | 43,376.45                                               | 23,376.45                                                                             |
| Iowa.....           | 38,326.53                                               | 18,326.53                                                                             |
| Kansas.....         | 34,242.13                                               | 14,242.13                                                                             |
| Kentucky.....       | 45,620.09                                               | 25,620.09                                                                             |
| Louisiana.....      | 38,406.64                                               | 18,406.64                                                                             |
| Maine.....          | 27,003.21                                               | 7,003.21                                                                              |
| Maryland.....       | 32,707.01                                               | 12,707.01                                                                             |
| Massachusetts.....  | 49,380.33                                               | 29,380.33                                                                             |
| Michigan.....       | 57,474.10                                               | 37,474.10                                                                             |
| Minnesota.....      | 40,613.70                                               | 20,613.70                                                                             |
| Mississippi.....    | 40,502.56                                               | 20,502.56                                                                             |
| Missouri.....       | 46,524.03                                               | 26,524.03                                                                             |
| Montana.....        | 24,145.99                                               | 4,145.99                                                                              |
| Nebraska.....       | 31,199.67                                               | 11,199.67                                                                             |
| Nevada.....         | 20,626.55                                               | 626.55                                                                                |
| New Hampshire.....  | 23,419.87                                               | 3,419.87                                                                              |
| New Jersey.....     | 45,960.92                                               | 25,960.92                                                                             |
| New Mexico.....     | 25,697.78                                               | 5,697.78                                                                              |
| New York.....       | 106,669.77                                              | 86,669.77                                                                             |
| North Carolina..... | 54,926.68                                               | 34,926.68                                                                             |
| North Dakota.....   | 26,107.61                                               | 6,107.61                                                                              |
| Ohio.....           | 64,355.52                                               | 44,355.52                                                                             |
| Oklahoma.....       | 40,235.36                                               | 20,235.36                                                                             |
| Oregon.....         | 25,660.27                                               | 5,660.27                                                                              |
| Pennsylvania.....   | 92,725.40                                               | 72,725.40                                                                             |
| Puerto Rico.....    | 50,764.02                                               | 30,764.02                                                                             |
| Rhode Island.....   | 24,793.84                                               | 4,793.84                                                                              |
| South Carolina..... | 38,671.06                                               | 18,671.06                                                                             |
| South Dakota.....   | 25,954.79                                               | 5,954.79                                                                              |
| Tennessee.....      | 43,222.71                                               | 23,222.71                                                                             |
| Texas.....          | 69,989.86                                               | 49,989.86                                                                             |
| Utah.....           | 25,515.32                                               | 5,515.32                                                                              |
| Vermont.....        | 22,839.16                                               | 2,839.16                                                                              |
| Virginia.....       | 43,734.88                                               | 23,734.88                                                                             |
| Washington.....     | 29,670.11                                               | 9,670.11                                                                              |
| West Virginia.....  | 36,792.80                                               | 16,792.80                                                                             |
| Wisconsin.....      | 43,343.57                                               | 23,343.57                                                                             |
| Wyoming.....        | 21,948.19                                               | 1,948.19                                                                              |

Miss LENROOT. There is another provision of \$960,000, approximately, which would be used in conducting special demonstration services in the fields of maternal care and maternal and child health, concerning certain problems about which our present information is inadequate to afford a basis for the most effective campaigns against infant mortality, maternal mortality, and conditions impairing the health of children. Some of the things that need to be done especially, under this provision of the act, would be intensive demonstrations of administrative procedures in certain areas, such as those carried on by the American Child Health Association and the Commonwealth some years ago; studies of the adequacy of facilities for maternal care; studies of the reasons why some of these States show up so black on our infant mortality map and maternal mortality map; studies of the nutritional condition of children; studies of methods of promoting growth and development, and the nutritional condition of children; the effects of inadequate food and special types of diet on child health; the health and nutrition of adolescent children in industry and in school; nervous instabilities related to delinquency and conduct problems; and causes of dental defects among children.

The specifications of this section of the bill provide again for plans to show reasonable provision for administration, State financial participation, cooperation with medical, nursing, and welfare groups and organizations, due consideration to areas and groups in special need, and conformity with accepted standards of public-health practice developed by Federal bureaus and other agencies.

I may say that the program outlined in the bill has been gone over in consultation with some of those who have been interested in developing the public-health provisions of the bill, and that the administration of these would be closely coordinated through consultation in making sure that the activities were directed in the most effective manner.

I think I will take just a moment on the care of crippled children, unless there are questions. Section 702, page 54, provides for an appropriation of \$3,000,000 to be allotted \$20,000 to each State and the rest on a basis of need. I will explain for a moment why it is that the bill suggests so large an appropriation to be allotted on the basis of need. "Need" here refers not only to economic need but to the extent of conditions causing crippling, because as the committee knows, there are certain areas of the country that suffer from epidemics such as poliomyelitis epidemics, where the number of crippled children in proportion to the population would be excessively high.

I have here a map showing the distribution of poliomyelitis or infantile paralysis from 1915 to 1929. The black and the purple are the States with the highest incidence. I have another map showing the same thing for 1930 to 1933. A comparison of the two maps shows a considerable shifting in the areas of greatest need, so that it is not possible to predict absolutely just how this money would be apportioned.

The need for extended service of this kind in spite of the great amount that is being done by private organizations such as were mentioned yesterday, is brought out by the fact that the White House conference on the care of children in 1930, reported at least 5,000 crippled children on the waiting lists of hospitals, waiting admission. Indications are that in a great many instances remedial procedures which ought to be undertaken to save children from serious crippling conditions have not been undertaken because of financial distress of the family or the community and the lack of adequate facilities.

There are 10 States that have a fairly comprehensive State-wide program for dealing with these situations. These 10 are Florida, Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wisconsin. There are in all 35 States that have made some appropriations, but some of them are so very, very meager as to be almost negligible.

Without objection, I shall file a table showing the amounts appropriated and something with reference to the administrative agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be included in the record.

(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE XIII.—State and local public funds for care of crippled children <sup>1</sup>

| State                            | Total     | State funds for                     |                                       | Local funds supplementing State funds | Public expenditure per 100,000 population <sup>2</sup> | Agency administering                                                     |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                  |           | Care, treatment, and rehabilitation | Maintenance of State hospital service |                                       |                                                        |                                                                          |
| Alabama.....                     | \$5,000   | \$5,000                             | -----                                 | -----                                 | \$189                                                  | State board of education.                                                |
| Arkansas.....                    | 9,250     | -----                               | \$9,250                               | -----                                 | 499                                                    | Trustees of Children's Home and Hospital.                                |
| California.....                  | 36,478    | 10,000                              | -----                                 | \$26,478                              | 643                                                    | State department of health.                                              |
| Connecticut.....                 | 84,000    | -----                               | \$84,000                              | -----                                 | 5,227                                                  | Board of trustees of Newington Home for Crippled Children.               |
| Florida.....                     | 50,000    | 50,000                              | -----                                 | -----                                 | 3,303                                                  | Commission for crippled children.                                        |
| Illinois.....                    | -----     | ( <sup>3</sup> )                    | \$89,558                              | -----                                 | -----                                                  | Department of health.                                                    |
| Indiana.....                     | -----     | -----                               | ( <sup>4</sup> )                      | ( <sup>5</sup> )                      | -----                                                  | State University Hospital.                                               |
| Iowa.....                        | -----     | -----                               | ( <sup>6</sup> )                      | -----                                 | -----                                                  | Do.                                                                      |
| Kansas.....                      | -----     | 5,000                               | ( <sup>7</sup> )                      | -----                                 | -----                                                  | Crippled children's commission.                                          |
| Kentucky.....                    | 110,000   | 110,000                             | -----                                 | -----                                 | 4,207                                                  | State board of health; crippled children's commission.                   |
| Maryland.....                    | -----     | -----                               | \$26,000                              | \$48,889                              | -----                                                  | Board of State aid and charities.                                        |
| Michigan.....                    | 180,824   | 5,000                               | 175,824                               | -----                                 | 4,255                                                  | Department of public welfare.                                            |
| Minnesota.....                   | -----     | 51,000                              | \$500,000                             | -----                                 | -----                                                  | Crippled children's commission; State University Hospital.               |
| Mississippi.....                 | -----     | -----                               | <sup>10</sup> 201,750                 | -----                                 | 871                                                    | State department of institutions.                                        |
| Missouri.....                    | 17,500    | <sup>11</sup> 17,500                | -----                                 | -----                                 | 1,378                                                  | State board of education.                                                |
| Montana.....                     | 50,000    | -----                               | 50,000                                | -----                                 | 2,455                                                  | State University Hospital.                                               |
| Nebraska.....                    | 13,200    | 13,200                              | -----                                 | -----                                 | 10,531                                                 | Orthopedic commission.                                                   |
| Nevada.....                      | 145,114   | -----                               | 145,114                               | -----                                 | 645                                                    | University Hospital.                                                     |
| New Hampshire.....               | 3,000     | 3,000                               | -----                                 | -----                                 | 2,867                                                  | Department of public welfare.                                            |
| New Jersey.....                  | 115,850   | 15,000                              | -----                                 | 100,850                               | 9,024                                                  | Department of health; crippled children's commission.                    |
| New York.....                    | 1,135,970 | 321,405                             | 493,160                               | 321,405                               | 3,432                                                  | Department of education; department of health.                           |
| North Carolina.....              | 108,800   | 8,000                               | 100,800                               | -----                                 | -----                                                  | Department of health; State Orthopedic Hospital.                         |
| North Dakota <sup>12</sup> ..... | -----     | -----                               | -----                                 | -----                                 | -----                                                  | State board of control.                                                  |
| Ohio.....                        | 295,836   | 17,772                              | -----                                 | <sup>13</sup> 278,064                 | 5,433                                                  | Department of public welfare.                                            |
| Oklahoma.....                    | 179,188   | -----                               | 179,188                               | -----                                 | 7,438                                                  | State University Hospital.                                               |
| Oregon.....                      | -----     | -----                               | ( <sup>14</sup> )                     | ( <sup>15</sup> )                     | -----                                                  | Do.                                                                      |
| Pennsylvania.....                | 596,682   | 25,000                              | 571,682                               | -----                                 | 6,190                                                  | Department of public welfare; department of health.                      |
| South Carolina.....              | 10,112    | 10,112                              | -----                                 | -----                                 | 582                                                    | State department of health.                                              |
| South Dakota.....                | 2,500     | 2,500                               | -----                                 | -----                                 | 361                                                    | State board of health.                                                   |
| Tennessee.....                   | 10,000    | ( <sup>16</sup> )                   | -----                                 | -----                                 | -----                                                  | Department of institutions.                                              |
| Texas.....                       | 45,300    | 20,000                              | 25,300                                | -----                                 | 675                                                    | State Orthopedic Hospital (University Hospital) department of education. |
| Vermont.....                     | 8,000     | 8,000                               | -----                                 | -----                                 | 2,224                                                  | Department of public health.                                             |
| Virginia.....                    | 25,000    | 25,000                              | -----                                 | -----                                 | 1,032                                                  | State board of health.                                                   |
| West Virginia.....               | 85,000    | 85,000                              | -----                                 | -----                                 | 4,916                                                  | Department of public welfare.                                            |
| Wisconsin.....                   | -----     | -----                               | ( <sup>17</sup> )                     | ( <sup>18</sup> )                     | -----                                                  | State Orthopedic Hospital; board of control.                             |

<sup>1</sup> Figures given are appropriations except in Massachusetts and New York, and local funds in California, which are expenditures. Figures for the year 1933 used for 15 States and for 131, 32 or 34 in others. (Exclusive of vocational rehabilitation funds.)

<sup>2</sup> Rate calculated only when public expenditures were known to be fairly complete.

<sup>3</sup> State aid given to private hospital.

<sup>4</sup> Amount not known.

<sup>5</sup> This figure to be verified.

<sup>6</sup> Care provided in State University Hospital, cost paid entirely or partly by counties.

<sup>7</sup> Care provided in State University Hospital, cost paid by State.

<sup>8</sup> State aid and local contributions to two orthopedic hospitals.

<sup>9</sup> Estimate based on total appropriation for both ill and crippled children.

<sup>10</sup> In addition some children receiving care in State University Hospital paid for jointly by State and county.

<sup>11</sup> Includes medical care of crippled adults.

<sup>12</sup> No funds available in 1934.

<sup>13</sup> Exclusive of Cuyahoga County.

<sup>14</sup> Amount not known. Appropriation in 1931, \$5,000; \$31,000 set as maximum.

Miss LENROOT. The programs would be developed under this section in close cooperation with the rehabilitation services of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation, totaling approximately \$1,100,000 per year, is for persons 14 years of age and over, chiefly those who are employable. The amount in this section would be not so limited, and undoubtedly would be directed mainly to the younger-age groups. But we would hope to work out the program in very close cooperation with the rehabilitation services. The money made available in this section would be used primarily for restorative care, medical care, hospital care, and after-care, for diagnosis, and for locating the children in need of care. There would be some services which we certainly would have to work in close cooperation with the rehabilitation services, but the main feature of this would be the restorative and preventive care. We would hope to be able to help the States to develop means of getting in very quickly to children suffering, for example, from infantile paralysis, so that the causes that might lead to a serious crippling condition would be arrested at the earliest possible stages.

Because of the great need in rural areas and the difficulties of getting to these areas, this section of the bill again emphasizes the development of plans which would include special attention to rural areas; and similar provisions as to cooperation with medical and health groups and other agencies are incorporated in this section of the bill.

I think that completes my statement.

Mr. TREADWAY. Miss Lenroot, when I came to Congress, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. I. L. Lenroot, was one of the leaders of the House in both constructive legislative ideas and ability to express himself most eloquently, forcibly, and clearly on the floor. I can well see where you have inherited his great qualifications for public service.

Miss LENROOT. Thank you very much, Mr. Treadway.

The CHAIRMAN. I concur in the remarks of my colleague. Mr. Lenroot was in Congress when I arrived and remained here a great many years. Since I first came here I have not seen a more capable or a better Member of Congress than he.

Miss LENROOT. Thank you very much.

Mr. McCORMACK. Miss Lenroot, on page 53, under the title "Maternal and Child Health", and on page 55, under the title "Care of Crippled Children", appears this language, in relation to the character of State plans necessary to comply with the requirements in this act, which, of course, would be Federal law [reading]:

A State plan must include \* \* \* cooperation with medical, health, and welfare groups and organizations.

Just what does that language mean?

Miss LENROOT. It means that the work that would be carried on would have to be so planned as to be very closely coordinated with other services. For example, if we have a child-health program in a local community which has available a general public-health service, the exact way in which the child-health nursing and maternity nursing would be developed in relation to the other public-health nursing services would have to be set out in the plan so that there would be no duplication or overlap.

With reference to physicians, it would be very important to be sure that the county medical societies, for example, were being informed and being consulted with reference to the work that was to be undertaken, and that so far as possible the fullest cooperation was being obtained from the private physicians, as well as the agencies—such as the Tuberculosis Association or a society for crippled children or a privately financed visiting nurses association—to be sure that their work was being brought into the picture and that nothing that was developed would impair or detract from the very great service being done by these other groups.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who is going to determine what medical, nursing, or welfare groups and organizations the States will have to have in this set-up, assuming there are various groups? Who is going to determine that?

Miss LENROOT. The Children's Bureau would examine the plans that were submitted under the act and through the visits of the staff—certainly we want to get in personal touch with the States, as well as keep in touch through correspondence—would be able to determine whether the other existing agencies in the State had been brought into consultation and whether the available services in the State were being utilized. With reference to the local community, it would have to depend mainly upon the effectiveness of the State administration.

Mr. VINSON. As I read this, this plan is submitted by the State.

Miss LENROOT. The plan is submitted by the State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but it is a direction by the Federal Government to the State as to what the State shall do.

Miss LENROOT. The Federal Government has the approval of the plans submitted by the State.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but this is a direction by the Federal Government. If the State does not submit a plan that meets with the approval of somebody in Washington, relating to private activities entirely out of the scope of governmental activities, then somebody in the Federal Government can disapprove that plan. That is true, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. Yes; it would be true.

Mr. VINSON. Then I suggest that that same condition will obtain in respect of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance, where the administration of that law is left with the States.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. VINSON. The Federal Government has that power of reviewing the plan and seeing that it comes up to the general standard outlined in the bill; is not that correct?

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but there is nothing in the unemployment insurance or the old-age pension which directs the State in its set-up to go into the field of private activity, is there? This is a direction to the State as such as to what its plan must be in its own capacity.

Miss LENROOT. It would seem to me very reasonable to expect that in passing on a plan the Federal Government should take into consideration whether the funds available were reaching primarily areas that were poorly supplied with private services, whether they were used to supplement certain types of need that the private services did not supply, because we are not going to have enough

money to take care of the whole job here, or whether it was being unintelligently planned to duplicate services that were already given. That was the only intent of this particular phraseology.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this language contemplates going into the field of charitable organizations, for example.

Miss LENROOT. Only insofar as they are brought into the general plan.

Mr. McCORMACK. But it does contemplate that, does it not? Are you not going to assume that the State is going to cooperate in every way possible, without the use of such language, with medical, nursing, and welfare groups, and organizations of a private nature?

Miss LENROOT. It seems to me very helpful to set forth in the bill, Mr. McCormack that—

Mr. McCORMACK. Do you not think that this language is unnecessary, and that is capable of a construction that the Federal Government is indirectly trying to dominate and control private charitable activities?

Miss LENROOT. No, sir. I would feel that it would rather assure private charitable activities that their functions were to be taken into consideration without any intent to dominate.

Mr. McCORMACK. This calls for the cooperation of the State with the private agencies.

Miss LENROOT. It is optional. If a private agency does not wish to cooperate, there is no way you can possibly coerce them. It is felt that the public agency must take into consideration what the private agencies are trying to accomplish, but there would be nothing that would impose any right on any State or the Federal Government to dictate or dominate in any way a private agency.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is the only part of this bill, is it not, that enters directly into the field of private activity?

Miss LENROOT. I do not think this does.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to suggest that on page 3, on your old-age pensions, you have a State plan submitted by the State to the Federal Government, and we have been told that there are many private institutions that have set up reserves for old-age pensions. You are going into that field under the old-age-pension plan just as much or more, as I see it, as here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where is it? What is the language? Show me the language.

Mr. VINSON. Take section 4 [reading]:

A State plan for old-age assistance, offered by the State authority for approval, shall be approved by the administrator only if such plan (a) \* \* \* (b) \* \* \* (c) \* \* \* (d) \* \* \* (e) \* \* \* and (f) \* \* \*.

We have all those sections with a broad comprehensive foundation—

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. That States must recognize in order to have uniformity and universality in the operation of the plan. It seems to me that the charitable institutions and organizations that the gentleman has referred to would be happy indeed to have the Federal Government come in here and relieve them somewhat of that work.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where is there on page 3—I am not discussing the authority of the Federal Government to approve reasonable management—with relation to old-age pensions any language that the State shall submit a plan of cooperation with any private charity?

Mr. VINSON. The Federal Government will approve it only if such plan [reading]:

(a) Is State-wide, includes substantial financial participation of the State, and if administered by subdivisions of the State, is mandatory upon such subdivisions; and

(b) Establishes or designates a single State authority to administer or supervise the administration of the plan and insures methods of administration which are approved by the administrator.

Subsection (b) is the one that particularly fits.

Certainly that enters the field of private endeavor in respect to private industry, setting up funds for old-age pensions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but that calls for the establishment and designation of a single State authority. That does not call for the State authority to include in its plan to the Federal Government, under direction from the Federal Government, cooperation with any charitable activity.

Mr. VINSON. As I see it, it is all inclusive, when you say that this single-State authority is going to be set up to administer or supervise the administration of the plan, and it insures methods of administration which are approved by the administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot agree with my friend. We could argue all day, but I cannot agree with you.

Do you think this is necessary?

Miss LENROOT. I do not think it is necessary, but I think it is advisable to assure the medical profession, for instance, or the nursing profession, that these plans——

Mr. McCORMACK. Please get my thought in mind. I am not entering into any controversy about the practical advisability of it.

Miss LENROOT. No; I understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am discussing whether or not you think it is necessary to have incorporated in the bill that language.

Miss LENROOT. I should prefer that it be incorporated, but I do not think it is essential.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not essential. I think you get my point.

Miss LENROOT. I get your point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose, for example, there are several different organizations in my State in the same field of activity. Suppose the State plan recommends cooperation with one, and the other six demand that they be recognized. There is likelihood of controversy there. Suppose that the State plan recommends one and somebody down here does not approve that one, but approves somebody else, because we know that charitable organizations, many of them, are disguised. They have objectives with which some people could not honestly disagree.

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. What language does the gentleman refer to as not being essential?

Mr. McCORMACK (reading):

and cooperation with medical, health, and welfare groups and organizations.

Outside of that language, everything else is a direction to the State in the performance of its duty as a sovereign body. That is true, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is the only language in the entire bill which goes beyond that proper sphere and makes a direction to a State with reference to a worthy, deserving, but private field of activity. That is true, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. If you interpret the language that way. Of course, Mr. McCormack, as I pointed out before, it seems to me very important that this go on record that we are not going in to upset the whole tradition of medical practice, for instance. We are going to take into account the contributions and views and the services available through private physicians, through private nursing groups, and through other groups.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, and I am in harmony with it in its practical operation, but when you put the specific language in there, it is establishing a policy which we have never established before.

Miss LENROOT. I can only repeat that I do not think it is essential language. I should greatly prefer to see it left in, but I do not——

Mr. McCORMACK. But you have no objections to it?

Miss LENROOT. I say the bill could be administered without it.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to suggest that the policy of allowing this credit to separate industrial units on the old-age-pension plan after the reserve is built up is certainly going into the field of private endeavor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Vinson, that is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. VINSON. I know; but you are making a broad statement that this language here is the only place in the bill where there is any invasion of the field of private industry, as I get your statement, and I just cannot agree with my good friend on that point.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. On the old-age pensions themselves, the bill directs the State as to the broad essentials of its legislation. Within its broad essentials, it says to an employer: "You build up a 15-percent reserve after 5 years to meet the unemployment provisions, and you can thereby lower your production costs to that extent." We are going to recognize the field of private initiative. That is the purpose of it, is it not, and properly so?

Miss LENROOT. I presume so; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, instead of throwing me in with the inefficient employer, if I am able to conduct my business where I can build up a reserve, my production costs would be less than 3 percent, and I stabilize my employment, I am going to receive the benefit of that.

Mr. VINSON. Thereby permitting the goods to be manufactured at lower cost to go in competition with the neighbor across the street who has not that preference. Is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. The theory of that is to prevent standardization, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. I presume so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and regimentation, in a sense. That is true, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. I am not qualified to speak for the old-age and unemployment sections of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that is a direction to the State as to what is contemplated as a public activity, a public duty, a public responsibility. That is true, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And by State law. That is true, is it not?

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The private charities are organized in the main outside of State law, are they not?

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Deserving though they may be, and meritorious, you would not want by any language in this bill to put private charities directly or indirectly under the domination of the Federal Government, would you?

Miss LENROOT. No, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do you not recognize that there might be that possibility under the language employed there, although the framers of it never so intended?

Miss LENROOT. I still do not see it, sir; but as I said before, the language is not absolutely essential.

Mr. VINSON. When you strike it out, though, you may prevent this Federal fund from cooperating with these worthy organizations and thereby limit the beneficial effect?

Miss LENROOT. You might at least create an apprehension.

Mr. McCORMACK. This Federal fund is for those organizations who cooperate?

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. They will cooperate anyway, in all probability, will they not?

Miss LENROOT. The only thing this was intended to do was to make sure that the public effort was not directed in a way that would upset or jeopardize the general community services, which must include both public and private to be complete.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose there are several organizations and one is given the preference. That would upset it, would it not?

Miss LENROOT. Presumably the one that was given the preference would be the one that was really rendering service.

Mr. McCORMACK. But who is going to pass on that? The other 6, if there are 7, will say that the one who determined that is wrong.

Miss LENROOT. It seems to me that this language of cooperation is very general language, and would not require a State to submit exact details as to all of the agencies. For instance, in some cities there are as many as 60 or 70 or 90 agencies in a council of social agencies. You would not expect a State plan to list all those agencies, to single out this agency and that agency, but you would expect them to say that a welfare or health organization, for instance, was cooperating and joining in with the community plan being carried on by the council of social agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under this is a possibility of what somebody might term "discrimination." In other words, I do not see the necessity of this language, but I cannot see where, if it is permitted to remain in there, it is likely to do an awful lot of harm. You want to remember that there are various groups. This is a country of various nationals, various issues, various emotions.

Miss LENROOT. I appreciate your concern, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. You have to be very careful when you go into the social field and undertake to have the Federal Government directly or indirectly inject itself in there and affect those who are working in the social or the charitable or the medical fields.

Miss LENROOT. I appreciate it, sir. If the committee feels that the disadvantages of the language outweigh the languages, I should certainly accept the judgment of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. My questions are not hostile, because I am friendly to it.

Miss LENROOT. I appreciate your attitude.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I am making a constructive suggestion with reference to the future.

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to say at the outset of this that I also served with your father and concur in everything that has been said as to his ability.

Miss LENROOT. Thank you; I certainly appreciate that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think there is considerable merit to the point that is made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. We know that there are a great many private agencies that are now engaged in this relief work, conducting orphanages, homes for crippled children, and so on. It would seem that we should throw ample safeguards about these organizations so that there would be no danger of their being discriminated against either intentionally or through prejudice. I think it can be done without seriously affecting the objects that are sought to be obtained by the bill.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. What percentage of crippled children are cured or helped through treatment?

Miss LENROOT. May I ask Dr. Eliot that? Do you have that, Dr. Eliot?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, certainly.

Dr. MARTHA ELIOT. I cannot give you the exact figures in answer to that question. I know that in a recent report from Michigan there were a large number of children reported as cured, I think about 3,000 out of some 11,000 that had been under their supervision in the past 5 years.

I am giving those figures from memory, so that I cannot give you the figures exactly accurate.

Mr. VINSON. I do not know what the general practice is in regard to the surgeons throughout the country in this work on crippled children, but I do happen to know something about it in my own State of Kentucky.

Miss LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. I just wondered if the surgeons throughout the country were generous in the contribution of their skill and services in this work? I know that is eminently correct in my State.

Miss LENROOT. I would say they were very generous. Would you not say so also, Doctor?

Dr. MARTHA ELIOT. Yes; very decidedly so.

Mr. KNUTSON. Miss Lenroot, how does this country rank in the matter of deaths of mothers from childbirth?

Miss LENROOT. It has a very poor record. There are almost no countries for which we have accurate information that have as high a death rate. We have a report in press on comparability and trend of maternal death rates in the United States and in other countries. The figures had been challenged on the basis that the procedure in ascribing deaths of women to causes connected with childbirth was not comparable as between the United States and different countries.

Quite extensive study was made by the Children's Bureau in cooperation with the Bureau of Census and in connection with the White House Conference, and the results show that in general, although there would be some changes if methods in use in certain foreign statistical offices were followed, the United States would still have one of the highest rates.

Mr. KNUTSON. How does the number of deaths compare in States and in countries where midwives are permitted to practice, as against States and countries where they are not permitted to practice?

Miss LENROOT. Will you permit Dr. Eliot to answer that question?

Mr. KNUTSON. Have you that information?

Miss LENROOT. Doctor, can you answer that?

Dr. MARTHA ELIOT. I can submit to the committee a table showing the trend of maternal mortality in the United States and in certain foreign countries. Certain of these foreign countries have, of course, a larger proportion of the deliveries done by midwives, and in a number of them, especially the Scandinavian countries, the maternal mortality rates are lower than in the United States.

Miss LENROOT. May we have this table introduced?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it may be inserted in the record.

(The table above referred to is as follows:)

TABLE XIV.—*Trend of maternal mortality in the United States and certain foreign countries*

| Country                          | Maternal deaths <sup>1</sup> per 10,000 live births |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                  | 1915                                                | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 |
| Australia.....                   | 43                                                  | 53   | 56   | 47   | 47   | 50   | 47   | 45   | 51   | 55   | 56   | 53   | 59   | 60   | 51   | 53   | 55   |
| Belgium.....                     | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | 72   | 60   | 57   | 53   | 56   | 58   | 50   | 61   | 57   | 60   | 62   | 62   | 49   |
| Canada.....                      | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 51   | 55   | 54   | 60   | 56   | 57   | 56   | 56   | 57   | 58   | 51   |
| Chile.....                       | 65                                                  | 73   | 72   | 82   | 88   | 75   | 79   | 80   | 74   | 61   | 61   | 58   | 58   | 59   | 78   | 68   | 75   |
| Czechoslovakia.....              | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | 37   | 40   | 37   | 34   | 32   | 31   | 33   | 34   | 36   | 40   | 43   | 41   | 41   |
| Denmark.....                     | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 16   | 20   | 26   | 23   | 24   | 27   | 31   | 27   | 32   | 38   | 40   | 35   |
| England and Wales.....           | 42                                                  | 41   | 39   | 38   | 44   | 43   | 39   | 38   | 38   | 39   | 41   | 41   | 41   | 44   | 43   | 44   | 41   |
| Estonia.....                     | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 45   | 40   | 38   | 41   | 41   | 50   | 46   | 49   | 43   |
| Finland.....                     | ---                                                 | 36   | 38   | 44   | 40   | 36   | 33   | 30   | 31   | 35   | 29   | 32   | 30   | 30   | 55   | 54   | 51   |
| Germany.....                     | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 73   | 72   | 85   | 88   | 67   | 59   | 61   | 66   | 71   | 58   | ---  |
| Greece.....                      | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  |
| Hungary.....                     | ---                                                 | 42   | 40   | 52   | 29   | 32   | 29   | 30   | 28   | 31   | 29   | 32   | 30   | 34   | 34   | 36   | 37   |
| Irish Free State.....            | 53                                                  | 57   | 49   | 48   | 47   | 49   | 50   | 57   | 48   | 48   | 47   | 49   | 45   | 49   | 41   | 48   | 43   |
| Italy.....                       | 22                                                  | 27   | 30   | 37   | 29   | 28   | 26   | 25   | 27   | 32   | 28   | 26   | 28   | 29   | 27   | 28   | 30   |
| Japan.....                       | 36                                                  | 35   | 35   | 38   | 33   | 35   | 36   | 33   | 34   | 31   | 30   | 27   | 28   | 28   | 27   | 27   | 25   |
| Lithuania.....                   | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 59   | 56   | 50   | 50   | 57   | 60   | 62   | 55   |
| Netherlands.....                 | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | 29   | 33   | 24   | 23   | 25   | 23   | 24   | 26   | 29   | 29   | 34   | 34   | 33   | 32   |
| New Zealand.....                 | 47                                                  | 59   | 60   | 52   | 51   | 65   | 51   | 51   | 51   | 50   | 47   | 42   | 49   | 49   | 48   | 51   | 48   |
| Northern Ireland.....            | 56                                                  | 50   | 51   | 47   | 46   | 69   | 52   | 47   | 49   | 45   | 44   | 56   | 48   | 52   | 49   | 53   | 51   |
| Norway.....                      | 27                                                  | 28   | 30   | 30   | 34   | 26   | 22   | 25   | 28   | 29   | 27   | 32   | 25   | 30   | 36   | 30   | 27   |
| Salvador.....                    | ---                                                 | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 57   | 57   | 46   | 50   | 57   | 50   | 56   | 63   | 56   | 53   | 49   | 56   |
| Scotland.....                    | 61                                                  | 57   | 59   | 70   | 62   | 62   | 64   | 66   | 64   | 58   | 62   | 64   | 64   | 70   | 69   | 69   | 59   |
| Sweden.....                      | 29                                                  | 27   | 25   | 26   | 32   | 27   | 27   | 25   | 23   | 24   | 26   | 29   | 28   | 33   | 38   | 35   | 37   |
| Switzerland.....                 | ---                                                 | 54   | 56   | 51   | 57   | 56   | 55   | 51   | 46   | 48   | 43   | 44   | 37   | 44   | 46   | 43   | 44   |
| United States <sup>2</sup> ..... | 61                                                  | 62   | 66   | 92   | 74   | 80   | 68   | 66   | 67   | 66   | 65   | 66   | 65   | 69   | 70   | 67   | 66   |
| Uruguay.....                     | 22                                                  | 29   | 32   | 30   | 23   | 34   | 33   | 27   | 27   | 25   | 25   | 30   | 22   | 24   | 24   | 31   | 24   |

<sup>1</sup> Deaths assigned to pregnancy and childbirth.

<sup>2</sup> Provisional.

<sup>3</sup> The United States expanding birth registration area, in 1915 it comprised 10 States and the District of Columbia; in 1933 the entire continental United States.

Figures from official sources.

Mr. KNUTSON. Miss Lenroot, how many bulletins on prenatal care and care of babies does your Bureau put out each year?

Miss LENROOT. We have 1 bulletin on prenatal care and 1 on infant care, and then dodgers and shorter leaflets on subjects connected with prenatal and infant care. The distribution of those bulletins varies from year to year. In 1933 the free distribution of Infant Care totaled 404,602 copies, and of Prenatal Care 161,701. In 1932 more copies were available—567,288 of Infant Care, and 228,828 of Prenatal Care.

Mr. KNUTSON. We put out a great many more bulletins on how to raise turkeys than that.

Miss LENROOT. We certainly do, and we never have enough to meet the need on infant care.

Mr. DINGELL. Regarding the medical profession in this instance, has the committee received any inquiries from the American Medical Association, for example? I know that they are intensely interested in the possibility of some so-called "regimentation." The reason I ask that question is, before I left Detroit the medical fraternity of Wayne County wanted to know something in connection with my personal views and the possibilities insofar as the Government's policy in the future was concerned. There has been some discussion or some mention made of nationalizing the medical profession. I am wondering whether in any set-up your committee has considered in connection with child welfare whether in the care of the infant immediately after birth, the care of the crippled child, or any other phase of this social-security program, there was any consideration given as to the possible regimentation of the medical profession so far as concerns taking this care out of the hands of the medical profession individually and placing it on some sort of a socialized basis.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir; there was consideration given to the policies with reference to the medical profession. A report was worked out in consultation with an advisory child welfare committee, which included in its membership Dr. Adair, professor of obstetrics at the University of Chicago; Dr. Grulee, professor of pediatrics at the Rush Medical School; and Dr. Grover Powers, professor of pediatrics at the Yale University Medical School. Next week I hope there are going to be hearings before this committee at which some of the physicians interested in the passage of this bill will appear to present testimony as to their belief that it is needed and that the provisions incorporated in this bill are sound.

There have been a great many letters and telegrams coming to the Secretary of Labor from public health officials and from physicians in various parts of the country urging the incorporation in the security program of provisions for public health and maternal and child health services. I am, of course, aware of the differences of opinion in medical groups as to policies of this character.

The American Medical Association has taken no action with reference to the provisions of this bill as yet so far as I know.

Mr. DINGELL. The traditional and ethical practice of the medical profession so far as individuality is concerned is fully protected, as you visualize the operation of this bill?

Miss LENROOT. Yes. That was one reason we wanted to leave in this clause about cooperation with medical and nursing groups.

Mr. DINGELL. In other words, there is no measure of any sort in this bill whereby private initiative of the medical profession is to be at all disturbed?

Miss LENROOT. It does not seem to me so, sir. I may illustrate by a type of activity that the Bureau has carried on for years in having a professor of obstetrics at Emory University, Georgia, give refresher courses to physicians in active practice as to the best methods of obstetrical care. He goes into a State on the invitation of the State board of health and the State medical society, which arrange with county medical societies for groups of doctors to be brought together and given instruction as to the best methods of obstetrical care. We have had hundreds of letters from private physicians in areas covered by this service expressing their great appreciation of its value.

Mr. DINGELL. What I am driving at is this, particularly, Miss Lenroot, that the fear on the part of some medical men in this country today is that the medical profession is going to be taken over by the Government.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir; I know that fear exists.

Mr. DINGELL. That the medical profession will function on the basis of a fixed fee from the Government.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. And that they will take care of the health services. I am just wondering, inasmuch as this is probably the first consideration given to the extensive service of the people from a Federal standpoint, as to child welfare, the care of mothers, prenatal and postnatal, and the care of crippled children, if there is any semblance of danger of any contemplated move on the part of the committee to bring about such regimentation as the medical profession fears.

Miss LENROOT. No, sir; I think not. I think the services in the bill will be mainly for strengthening the resources of the community, for education of mothers as to the importance of going to private physicians if they can possibly do so, and any plans that are developed with reference to any of the features of the bill will be developed with a close cooperation and after consultation with the medical resources in the community.

Mr. DINGELL. I send out very religiously all of my prenatal and infant-care books. I have fought with the Department; I have traded my year books and the books on the care of hogs, and so forth, for baby books; and I have tried to get those out to my people as far and as widely as I could. But we have had an avalanche of births in my district. I do not know whether it is as a result of this depression or in spite of it—in anticipation of the Townsend plan, possibly. But at any rate, I have not enough books. I am anxious to get an expression here now of record, because I hope to be able to get an increase in some appropriation. I think we are overlooking a bet. I am wondering whether the Department has made any effort to increase the appropriation for bulletins on prenatal care and infant care.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir. The appropriation bill pending before Congress carries some increase in the Department of Labor printing fund. Some of that increase is intended to make available a somewhat larger number of bulletins on infant care and prenatal care than we can now distribute. This is about our lowest point. Our funds are very short, and the printing costs have gone up very materially in the

Printing Office. Our estimates for this year as sent in to the Bureau of the Budget would have provided for enough money to about come back to our distribution of 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. DINGELL. What was that, do you remember, Miss Lenroot?

Miss LENROOT. I think there were about 560,000 bulletins on infant care at the peak, distributed free of charge.

Mr. DINGELL. My quota is 75 a month. I need 450. I swapped with some of my rural friends. But it is insufficient.

Miss LENROOT. You might get in touch with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DINGELL. I would be glad to do that, but I would like to get some official support.

Miss LENROOT. We should like very much to be able to distribute them more widely.

Mr. BROOKS. In the first map that you showed us here——

Miss LENROOT. Infant mortality.

Mr. BROOKS. There is quite an outstanding record there in the State of Washington.

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. Is there any reason that you know of or cause for that? Is there any activity there that might cause that?

Miss LENROOT. Washington has always had a low rate. It is partly the climatic conditions. Those Western States seem favorable. I suppose it is partly the character of the population and partly the services that have been made available. Washington has always been very low.

Mr. DUNCAN. Miss Lenroot, in your direct statement you mentioned something about the administration by the F. E. R. A. Did I understand that correctly?

Miss LENROOT. Yes, sir. The mothers' pension part of the bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. That is in the States?

Miss LENROOT. No, in the Federal administration. The state administration would be through established State agencies for administering mothers' pensions. It might be the juvenile court, it might be a welfare department, or some other agency.

Mr. DUNCAN. You do not recommend that the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in the States have anything to do with the administration of this?

Miss LENROOT. No, sir; because it is a permanent not an emergency program. Ultimately all those services should be coordinated, of course.

Mr. DUNCAN. The reason I ask if the Federal Emergency Relief Administration would do that is because it is not particularly popular in my State.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Miss Lenroot, for your appearance before the committee and the very helpful information you have given us.

The committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock Monday morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., an adjournment was taken until 10 a. m., Monday, Jan. 28, 1935.)

BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 034 54603 6